

especially the senior citizens and the middle class of our country.

□ 1415

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

(Mr. STOKES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Congressional Black Caucus substitute budget for fiscal year 1996. The CBC substitute is a caring budget, it shows compassion for the American people, and is one that the American people can be proud of. It not only balances the budget, the measure is responsive to the housing, health, education, and employment training needs of the American people.

Unlike the Republicans' budget proposal, House Concurrent Resolution 67, which holds our elderly hostage to their compromised health care condition and economic status, the Congressional Black Caucus substitute treats our elderly with the dignity and respect that they not only deserve—but have earned. Adequate funding is provided for the older Americans' programs including essential nutrition programs, low-income home-energy assistance, and assisted housing. Medicare is preserved.

Unlike the Republicans' budget proposal which forces our elderly to choose between food and heat, under the CBC alternative their quality of life is enhanced.

The CBC substitute is also kind to our Nation's children including those yet to be born. It provides adequate funding for Healthy Start, Child Care, and Head Start. Mr. Chairman, our children are our future. They have placed their future in our hands, we cannot sacrifice that trust.

In addition, the CBC substitute budget strengthens support for higher education, student aid, trio, education for the disadvantaged, school reform, biomedical research, and community infrastructure. The CBC has heard the voice of the American people, and responded with a sound budget that is fair, responsible, and overturns the Republicans' assault on our Nation's most vulnerable citizens—the children, the elderly, the veterans, and hard-working families.

Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Black Caucus substitute budget stands on its own merits. I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this budget which establishes our fiscal policy and priorities in a responsible and compassionate manner.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. BAKER].

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Chairman, this is the first time in 26 years that we are actually taking the first step toward balancing the budget. That means your grandchildren will not be paying \$187,000 in interest payments to the national debt during her lifetime, if she is born today, if we start today.

This budget is more of the same. More spending, more taxes, more power in Washington.

We need a capital gains tax, not as a tax for the rich but for those who will create jobs and bring revenue to Washington.

We need the tax relief for the young families, both parents working, so that they can spend not someone else's money but their own. That is what a \$500 tax credit does for families with children. We have got to stop the growth of power in Washington. We have got to stop the centralization of regulation in Washington. That is what returning power to local governments is all about. That is what the unfunded mandates bill was all about. We have to stop the overtaxation.

In 1960, we only paid about 10 percent of our income to the government. We are now paying 30 percent. Vote no on this relief. Vote "yes" on the Republican budget.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to announce that I oppose the substitute we have before us now and that I will vote in favor of the Kasich budget, even though I have great concern about the transportation parts of that budget.

Most importantly, to announce that the Speaker today has authorized me to announce that he is forming a task force to address the issue of taking the transportation trust funds out of the general fund budget, that the Speaker himself will chair that task force. And as the Speaker says in the letter making this announcement, "As you know, I have consistently stood with you in support of moving the transportation trust funds off budget."

So this is not the end but, rather, the beginning. I salute the Speaker for his dedication to our finding a way to remove these transportation trust funds from the general fund budget. It is really an issue of honesty in budgeting. We have 206 cosponsors now, I might say a majority of Republicans in the House cosponsoring the legislation. It is time we get on with doing it. I certainly want to compliment the Speaker for deciding that he will chair the task force to find a way to make this happen.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME].

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, Mr. and Mrs. Taxpayer, get ready, because after 4 months of blue smoke and mirrors, the Republican budget proposal is getting ready to pick your pockets. It gives a new meaning to the term "out of luck."

If you are on Medicaid or Medicare, you are now out of luck. If you receive unemployment benefits, you are out of luck. If you happen to be a college stu-

dent or the parent of a college student, you, too, are out of luck. If you believe in the importance of the National Endowment for the Humanities or the National Endowment for the Arts or the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, under the Republican budget proposal, you are out of luck. It gives tax breaks to the wealthy and gets away from the whole notion of trying to do anything about corporate welfare. Spends more money on weapons during a time of peace and plays games under the guise of balancing the budget.

We were given the task to balance the budget also and we have one we believe that is more humane, more dedicated to principle, more honest, more equitably distributed and more, quite frankly, American in many respects because it does not do unto people things that we would not have done to us.

And so I would ask Members of this body, as you watch this debate and as you come to the floor to cast this vote, recognize that we are talking about years of fiscal policy and ask yourself, when you juxtapose these two balanced budget amendments, which one comes the closest to where the American people do?

We believe that the proposal offered by the gentleman from New Jersey and the gentleman from New York that has the support of the Congressional Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus, meets that challenge. And we are prepared to debate that issue with anybody from the other side on any day and in this debate at any time.

I urge support of this and rejection of the so-called balanced budget amendment by the Republicans.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI].

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Let me remind our guests in the gallery that they are there as guests of the House. The rules of the House specifically prohibit any expressions of support or opposition to any of the speakers on the floor. The compliance of our guests in the gallery would be appreciated.

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, I want to join here today in congratulating the Black Caucus for their exercise. They bring not pretty photographs but ideas, ideas that challenge the majority of Members on the Democratic side and, in fact, ideas that challenge the status quo.

We on the Republican side stand here today to challenge the status quo also because the status quo is a killer. It murders any chance that our young people have of grabbing that brass ring, of dreaming of hope and opportunity, and it cheats everyone of their potentials right in the heart.

Take a look at this chart. This is the chart that we have been talking about,

and look at this bottom line. A child born today will pay in taxes on the interest rate close to \$200,000 over the course of their lifetime.

The Republicans believe in Robert and Mary and Sally. We believe that, given a fair chance, they can realize their American dream. Congress stands ready to challenge the status quo. Today the Republican Party will do what is right because this chart, this reality is not good enough for any one of your children.

Shame on anyone who fails today to seize this historic moment. Challenge the status quo and balance our budget for all of our children's future.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER].

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I thank my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus for producing this budget. It is a budget for all Americans and we all thank you for it.

This budget puts people first. It has been said that the moral test of a government is what it does for those who are in the dawn of life, that is its children, those in the sunset of life, its elderly, and those who are in the shadows of life, its sick and its disabled. The Republican budget fails this moral test. The Payne-Owens budget passes this test with flying colors.

My colleagues, let us support a budget that does, in fact, put people first. Let us support a budget for the caring majority. Let us vote yes on the Payne-Owens substitute.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ].

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Chairman, for reasons that are becoming ever more apparent for the last several months, I find even more than usual about family and about what kind of legacy this Congress is creating for families.

I thought about my parents, about their 75 years of sacrifice for their family, their children and their country. They have worked hard and saved and they have paid their taxes. They have paid their Social Security. They have paid their Medicare. And I wonder what kind of retirement this Congress envisions for our parents and grandparents with a mountain of debt that threatens Social Security and a Medicare system that if we stand back and do nothing goes bankrupt in 7 years.

I have thought about my child and all of our children, and I wonder what kind of future this Congress wants to leave these children. How will they educate their children and pave their roads and feed their needy and clean their water when they have to pay off the debt we ran up for programs and services we use now but we do not pay for?

Today we have the chance to protect families, to do what we have to do to protect Social Security, to improve and preserve Medicare so our parents

and grandparents are secure and safe. We have the chance to ensure our children's future, to end decades of piling debt on our children's head.

My baby and every baby born this year will pay \$187,000 in their lifetime for interest on the debt alone. Is that not enough?

It is time to balance this budget for our parents. It is time to balance this budget for our children.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Members of this House join me in voting for the Kasich budget for our families.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Black Caucus adds some truth in packaging for each of you. Each of you has been here all week talking about balancing the budget, but you have not thought about balancing the budget with compassion and with truth to the people of this country. You have not told, as the Congressional Black Caucus has done in their budget, to the senior citizens of this country that they are going to have to pay more than you are telling them.

You have not told them the truth. You have not shown them truth in packaging. The Black Caucus has. It did not cut the Medicaid and the Medicare funds. It did not cut the student loan funds. It did not cut all of these things you cut that you did not have to cut to give tax cuts to the rich.

What they did, they faced reality and showed that this budget could be balanced with compassion, and many of you have said forget about compassion. The CBC did what it should have done. It is highlighting education as its top priority, when we have people in this country who cannot read and write and who are poor because we have kept them there.

Face your conscience. The Black Caucus, I congratulate you.

□ 1430

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GOODLATTE].

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this substitute, and urge every Member of this House to vote for this historic opportunity to vote for a real balanced budget, and that is the Kasich balanced budget amendment. That is what is going to solve the problems of this country. It is going to return more money to the hard-working taxpayers of this country. That is what is going to be fair to all people all across this country. It does so in such a way that it does not create the kind of division that the Democrats on the other side would like to create in this debate.

Mr. Chairman, this is not about class warfare, this is about protecting the future of our children, our grand-

children, and about what is happening right now in this Congress, and what is happening right now in this country.

The fact of the matter is that with interest rates rising, the fact that the Federal Government borrows \$200 million a year means that interest rates continue to rise, and we can save a substantial amount of money if we can balance the budget and go about the business of this country.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT], the distinguished deputy whip.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the pending substitute and in strong support of the Kasich budget.

I have the greatest respect for the Members who bring this alternative to the House, and I appreciate the work they have done to make this substitute in order under the rule.

It is not easy to balance the budget.

If it were, the Congress would have done it years ago.

This budget alternative underscores the differences between Republicans and the more liberal members of the Democrat caucus.

The Payne substitute raises taxes by \$700 billion, while cutting defense by \$108 billion.

Clearly, this is not the path Republicans or most Americans are willing to take to a balanced budget.

My constituents believe they are taxed too much, and they also understand the necessary role the Government plays in promoting national security.

The Kasich budget provides tax relief, not tax increases.

I am especially pleased about its tax relief to senior citizens, who are now taxed at rates that discourage their active participation in job markets.

The Kasich budget also guards our national defense by keeping our defense spending at levels necessary to keep our people safe.

Mr. Chairman, cutting defense and raising taxes is not the best way to a balanced budget.

The Kasich budget is not painless. It is not perfect. But it is the best way to reach a balanced budget while maintaining a strong defense and providing tax relief to middle-class families.

I urge all Members to vote for the Kasich budget and vote against the Payne substitute.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Kasich budget.

Mr. Chairman, we hear over and over again that the Republican Kasich budget cuts spending to pay for tax cuts for the rich and the privileged, even though the other side of the aisle knows that we are increasing spending by \$1.2 trillion under our budget, and

even though they know that we are increasing spending on both Medicare and education.

Mr. Chairman, this class warfare argument pits Americans against Americans. In 1993, even though the President campaigned on a middle-class tax cut, he gave us the largest tax increase in history, \$240 billion. All we are trying to do in our Kasich budget is give Americans back some of the hard-earned dollars that the Clinton tax increase took away 2 years ago.

Let us look at the facts. In our Contract With America, we provide much needed tax relief to 42 million middle class Americans. Mr. Chairman, 75 percent of tax cuts go to families. Seventy-four percent of these families eligible for the \$500 per child tax credit earn less than \$75,000 a year.

Mr. Chairman, the second biggest falsehood levied by the other side is that the wealthy do not pay enough in taxes. Make no mistake, the better off in this country do carry a heavy share of the tax burden. I ask Members to judge for themselves.

According to the latest data available, the top 1 percent of income earners paid 27.4 percent of all Federal individual income taxes. The top 10 percent of wage earners paid 57.5 percent of total taxes, and the top 50 percent paid almost 95 percent of total income tax.

Mr. Chairman, the question can be asked "Whose money is this? Are these Washington dollars?" No, this money belongs to the American families, the small business owners, and the family farmers that make up this great Nation of ours.

All we are trying to do in the Republican Kasich budget is give back to the American people a portion of what the Clinton tax increase took away 2 years ago. Vote "yes" on the Kasich budget.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, do I understand correctly that this side has the right to close?

The CHAIRMAN. No. The Committee has the right to close.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY].

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to rise in strong support of a truly alternative budget. This proposal offered by the CBC balances the budget by making those responsible for the deficit pay for a change.

Working families have been paying more than their fair share of taxes all along. While the Republicans scapegoat Medicare and student loans as the culprit, the fact of the matter is that corporate welfare stars have been sponging off the American taxpayer family for decades.

The CBC budget closes the tax loopholes and giveaways, from which the Rupert Murdoch's of this country have benefited since the trickle-down years of the 1980's. Moreover, the CBC budget strengthens the programs which educate our children and heal our elderly.

Mr. Chairman, the CBC alternative budget does not cut Medicare to give the biggest tax grab in history to the privileged few. It is time to go after corporate welfare, not Medicare. Vote for the CBC budget alternative.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP], chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

(Mr. STUMP asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and I rise in opposition to the substitute.

Mr. Chairman, on what I consider to be the most important vote of my entire political career, I rise in the strongest possible support of this budget resolution. I have waited for the day when Congress would pass a truly balanced Federal budget through 40 years of public service at the State and Federal level, including leadership roles in both the Democratic and now Republican parties. The rising national debt and interest on that debt have created a crisis which Congress must face now. It is truly a matter of saving our country from financial ruin. Our children and grandchildren will either inherit a declining standard of living or gain freedom from the financial excesses of our generation.

Everyone in America will benefit from the long-term effects of balancing the Federal budget. Many Members have already highlighted much of the rationale for supporting this resolution so I will not repeat those arguments. As chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, however, I do want to address the concerns of Members worried about potential impacts on veterans and the VA. Dire predictions of numerous hospital closings and other consequences have been circulated in an effort to generate opposition to this resolution. Let there be no doubt, balancing the budget will be extremely difficult and the VA will share in those difficulties. But this is the beginning of the budget and spending process, not the end. I can assure all Members that the Veterans' Affairs Committee will remain committed to achieving adequate funding for the VA health care system. I am proud of my record of support for veterans during the time I have been privileged to serve in the House of Representatives. I thoroughly intend to continue that record of support for those who have worn our Nations uniform. When I leave political life and retire from public service, I believe I will be able to look veterans straight in the eye and honestly say I fulfilled my responsibilities to them. Every election campaign, I have promised veterans in my district that I was on their side, and in my heart I know I have been true to that promise. Voting for this resolution will not break that promise.

But, every election campaign I also promise that I am absolutely committed to balancing the federal budget and reducing the national debt. Yes, veterans are important to me. But in the context of this balanced budget debate, I must honestly say there are people more important to me than veterans. When I consider all the ramifications of whether we balance the budget by the year 2002, the most important people that come to mind are my own grandchildren and all the children of America.

For years, I have been very apprehensive about the legacy my tenure in Congress would leave to the children growing up in America today. The runaway national debt and the mounting interest payments needed to service that debt are stealing their future economic opportunity and prospects for a better standard of living than we are enjoying.

If I vote against this resolution, for any one parochial or political reason, how can I ever look my own grandchildren in the eye and honestly say I fulfilled my responsibilities to them?

The votes we cast today begin the budget process not end it. The House will work all summer on authorizations, appropriations, and reconciliation. I would say to all Members that I will work with them to identify the best possible way to help the VA health care system continue providing access to quality health care for eligible veterans over the next 7 years and beyond. I believe the dire predictions we are hearing about VA health care are premature. Administration officials know this is only the beginning of the budget process. As a matter of fact the Presidents' budget proposal projected about the same spending level for VA health care over the next 5 years as is proposed in the House budget recommendations. It is totally inconsistent for the administration to argue that the House budget forces hospital closures and theirs does not.

Mr. Chairman, I would conclude by saying to my colleagues, we can either pass a balanced budget and work to protect high priority veterans' programs. Or we can continue business as usual, ignore our national financial crisis, and add to the debt our children will have to repay. Vote for a balanced budget and leave a legacy to America's children that we can all be proud of.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER], the chairman of the Republican Conference.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, today is the proudest day of my career here in Congress. When I came here 4½ years ago, I came here to try to change the direction of this Government to ensure that my children and the Members' children have a better opportunity in the future than what we have today. Fourteen years ago when I first got myself involved in Government service, it was not for me that I got involved. It was because a Government that was out of control and out of touch with the American people needed to be reined in.

Today truly is a historic day in not only my career, but the career of every Member that is here, and a historic day for the American people, because today we are taking the first step in our effort to balance the budget and to restore the American dream for my children and every child in America.

I am also very proud of my colleagues, who today will cast their vote in favor of going down this path to not just balance the budget, but to renew the American dream; that the actions that we take today will decide the future for our children and theirs.

The question today that we have to ask ourselves is do we have the courage to change; do we have the courage to do the right thing for our children and yours; or are we going to shrink from the battle, shrink from the pressures of today, and sell our children and yours down the road as we have done for the last 25 years?

Mr. Chairman, I know that I am proud of my colleagues who today will cast their vote to do the right thing for their children, the right thing for their grandchildren, the right thing for senior citizens in this country who are threatened from a Government that is near fiscal bankruptcy and a country that is near moral bankruptcy. Therefore, the votes we cast today are important. Again, they are not about us, they are about our children and yours.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

(Mr. ENGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of Owens-Payne substitute.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, the Black Caucus budget has been an indispensable part of this process, because it demonstrates that we can balance the budget without robbing grandmothers and parents and kids and the pensions of Federal employees.

However, I want to challenge the assumption of this entire 2-day debate. Mr. Chairman, I balance my budget, but that is because I did not pay cash up front for my house. I balance, as businesses do their budgets, because they do not pay up front for equipment the way we pay up front for bombers and submarines.

We have been on an insane path to balance the budget with cash money, in a way that must make States and localities and businesses laugh at the top of their voices, because they do not have a unified budget the way we do; they have a capital budget, and an operating budget. We can never balance the budget fairly this way.

We are trying to balance the budget in a radically destructive, uniquely damaging way. The people who sent us here did not expect us to go stupid on them.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LATHAM].

(Mr. LATHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Owens budget, and in support of the Budget Committee's budget.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the budget alternative offered by Mr. OWENS and in support of the Budget Committee's balanced budget resolution.

While I disagree with almost all of the specifics of this budget, I commend the author for having the courage to put on paper what the President and leadership on the other side of the aisle only dream about.

Massive tax increases, massive spending increases on virtually every part of the Federal budget, dismantling cuts in national security.

However, at least you have had the courage to participate in the debate. It is a sad commentary that the leadership of your party has chosen to stand on the sidelines.

I would like to say a few words to my colleagues who have produced this budget and the earlier coalition budget as you consider whether to support final passage of a balanced budget.

After 25 years the time has come to stop pouring ever-increasing debt obligations on our children and grandchildren.

During the recent district work period, at every one of my 16 town meetings, the voice of the people of Iowa's fifth district was clear—the time has come for us all to stop worrying about our parochial interests and put this country's future first.

Why should we work to balance the budget?

A recent article in Time Magazine noted these likely benefits from balancing the budget.

Through lower interest rates, more than \$28,000 saved on the purchase of the average home.

Boosts the average family's take-home income by \$1,000 per year.

Creates 2.4 million additional jobs by 2005.

Reduces our projected national debt by more than half a trillion dollars.

Brings our national savings rate in line with economic competitors, and

Provides a \$500 per child tax credit for virtually every American family and tax relief for older Americans.

What do the opponents of the balanced budget offer?

We have yet to see a balanced budget proposed by the White House or the leadership of other party.

Some are even now saying we should never balance the budget—that our children's future is less important than preserving the status quo.

They have offered only fear, class warfare, empty slogans, and criticisms that ring hollow in view of their failure to offer an alternative.

There is no easy way to balance the budget, and not one Member of this House supports every single item in this bill.

But, for 25 years, Congress has failed to own up to its obligation to be fiscally responsible. Today, we can make history and restore to this institution.

Vote "yes" on final passage of the Republican balanced budget. Vote "yes" to control spending, cut taxes and, once and for all, end deficit spending.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON].

(Mr. DIXON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Payne-Owens amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to House Concurrent Resolution 67 and in support of the Payne-Owens substitute, offered on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus. The CBC

alternative stands in stark contrast to the proposal presented by the Republican majority.

The Republicans offer tax breaks to higher income Americans in exchange for reductions in medical care to older Americans; dramatically cut Federal spending under the guise of saving the next generation, while reducing education programs critical for the success of millions of that generation; and assume block granting and funding reductions in safety net programs, while reducing opportunities for training and self-sufficiency. In contrast, the Payne-Owens substitute recognizes the need to protect America's most vulnerable and invest in its people.

While I have reservations about aspects of the Payne-Owens substitute, the CBC has been forced to draft its budget under the Republican-imposed constraint of balancing the budget by the year 2002. I understand the virtue of a specific timetable to accomplish a goal. However, when faced with the magnitude of cuts necessary to achieve that goal, it is unconscionable that the majority will neither consider compromising on that time table nor scaling back on their fiscally irresponsible and unfair tax cut proposal.

The crisis facing this Nation is not the one envisioned by the Republicans if we fail to agree to the arbitrary goal of balancing the budget by 2002. The true crisis resides in our educational system; in our inability to train Americans and move them off welfare; in our decaying urban centers; and in our inability to ensure affordable health care to all Americans. The Republican budget exacerbates these crises by assuming drastic reductions in programs which seek to address them.

Republicans insist they are not cutting Medicare to finance their tax cut proposal. Yet the Congressional Budget Office projects that the level of Medicare spending allowable under the GOP budget is significantly less than the amount necessary to maintain benefits under current law.

Rather than address Medicare and Medicaid in the context of comprehensive health care reform, the GOP budget reduces Medicare spending by \$288 billion over the 7 years between 1996 and 2002. It is estimated that this cut will produce an increase in out-of-pocket expenses for recipients of \$3,500 over the next 7 years.

Funding for Medicaid is reduced by \$187 billion over 7 years—a cut of about one-third. Medicaid serves a diverse population of about 33 million people—60 percent are children, four million are elderly. Nearly 60 percent of health costs for the 2.9 million long-term care patients in America are paid for by Medicaid. Under Republican budget plans, nearly seven million children and one million elderly and disabled persons could lose coverage.

The Republican budget assumes reductions in welfare spending, while cutting job training funds by \$1.4 billion between 1996 and 2002—undermining their rhetoric about the need to transform welfare recipients into productive citizens.

Reductions in Federal education programs include some of the most short-sighted provisions in the Republican budget resolution. The cycle of dependence decry by the majority must first be addressed in our schools. Yet the Republican proposal reduces Head Start by \$209 million. The budget assumes elimination

of title 1 concentration grants—providing supplemental funding to assist low-achieving students, drug abuse and violence prevention programs, and the five TRIO programs. The latter programs have successfully encouraged young people from disadvantaged backgrounds to enter and complete college.

For the average college student receiving loans, the elimination of the in-school interest exemption will add over \$3,000 to the cost of a college education. These middle- and lower-income students and their families already face a rising financial burden in the quest for higher education. The budget cuts funding for libraries and numerous higher education grants, fellowships, and scholarships.

While the Republican budget reduces funding for education and training programs, the Congressional Black Caucus substitute calls for a 25-percent increase in education and training over the current funding level. This is an investment of \$154 billion more than the GOP budget over 7 years. The substitute provides full funding for the Head Start program by fiscal year 2002, increased funding for the Summer Youth Employment program, and more funds for Job Training Partnership Act programs.

If these programs need reform, then let's reform them. Elimination of these investments is a poor and cynical alternative to reform.

I have strong reservations about specific proposals included in the CBC alternative. While defense spending must continue to be scrutinized in the post-cold-war era, we must also take care to ensure our military readiness in the face of continued uncertainty around the world. I am also concerned that revenue proposals included in the alternative may be too harsh in their treatment of the business sector. Notwithstanding these reservations, I support the CBC budget as a symbol of the Caucus' continued commitment to inject into budget debates the importance of investing in the human capital of this Nation.

Republicans contend that unless we balance the Federal budget by 2002, we risk the well-being of the next generation of Americans. I do not dispute the need for fiscal responsibility. But I do strongly dispute the notion that an expanding American economy will benefit millions in that next generation if they are denied the tools to share in prosperity. It has not happened in the past, and it will not happen in the future. Overcoming poverty, dependency, and illiteracy requires compassion, investment, and creativity. The majority's budget is absent these ingredients.

I urge my colleagues to support the Payne-Owens substitute, and oppose House Congressional Resolution 67.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Congressional Black Caucus and the Owens and Payne amendment budget resolution.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

(Mr. CONYERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to once again support the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget, along with the Progressive Caucus.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the Congressional Black Caucus and Progressive Caucus budget and to urge my colleagues to vote in support of this balanced, caring approach to Federal spending.

Unlike the Republican budget, which fulfills their "Contract with Corporate America", this budget fulfills our contract with the American people. This budget is a caring budget that does not unfairly balance the budget on the backs of our Nation's children, elderly, poor, or working class. Our budget is evenhanded, it meets the economic and social needs of everyday Americans, and it promotes fiscal responsibility by balancing the budget by 2002.

The most important distinction between our budget and the majority's budget is our investment in our future. The majority wishes to balance the budget by 2002 so that our children will not have to pay for our excesses—but then the GOP goes on to deny children the very thing that will allow them to be competitive in the global market: A complete education.

We completely reject the notion that eliminating the Department of Education and reducing funds for libraries, Head Start, and the TRIO Program for first-generation college students will improve America—and the American public is on our side.

In addition, unlike the GOP budget, our budget does not give tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans. In fact, our budget cuts taxes for working people and closes corporate tax loopholes. Now is the time to end corporate welfare, and our budget does this.

We have also protected important job training and job creation programs, and have proposed targeted increases. It is foolhardy to believe that eliminating job training and creation programs will make our economy stronger. We must continue to dedicate resources toward expanding our economic foundation.

Finally, the CBC budget continues the tradition of advocating a saner defense budget. It is immoral to propose cutting education, workers' assistance, and other social programs without making substantive cuts in military spending.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FORD].

(Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Payne-Owens Congressional Black Caucus substitute, for their leadership and courage to say that the Members of this House ought to look at corporate welfare and how we ought to balance this budget, and not on the backs of everyday people in America, and let us get on about the business.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON].

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support

of the Congressional Black Caucus budget.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. BROWN].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, would the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], if he would have any time he could yield to this side of the aisle.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman, we are not quite sure. If the gentleman wants to come over here, I am happy to talk to him.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I hope Members can see this picture. This is a picture of Claude Pepper from Florida, a true champion of the elderly. He would be outraged over the attempt to reduce Medicare and Medicaid to a second-rate health care system so Republicans can pay for a \$355 billion tax cut for the wealthy. Veterans fare no better in this cruel Republican budget, which destroys the heart of the VA program, especially in Florida, where almost 100 new veterans arrive daily.

□ 1445

The Congressional Black Caucus budget is good for America's majority, for the elderly and veterans. It includes increases for Medicare and homeless programs. This caring majority budget remembers veterans and not just on Memorial Day. It also remembers the elderly and would be a tribute to Claude Pepper.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate Members on the other side for taking the time and being dedicated enough in our single objective of moving to a new America, and drawing up this budget and offering it on the floor.

But, Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of budget we are trying to move away from. We are moving away from the concept of increased taxes, of job-destroying taxes. We are moving toward a world in which there is job growth and opportunity.

Our budget, the Republican budget, seeks to cut spending. It seeks to do that by restraining the growth of spending. In doing that, we are trying to provide opportunity for the next generation.

The answer to this is not to defend the status quo. The people of American are ready for the tough choices. The Republican budget in fact does not punt when it is asked to deal with the tough choices. It takes them head-on.

The Congressional Black Caucus budget is projected to cost about \$12.75 trillion over 7 years. That is almost \$850 billion above the House Budget

Committee proposed level. It is spending that will be a sure recipe for disaster.

I congratulate my friends on the other side of the aisle, but I tell you that our children cannot afford this budget. It is a recipe to diminish hope and opportunity. It is not a budget that will restore growth. It will not put us on a path toward growth.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this CBC budget alternatives. This budget is about jobs. It is about job training, job security, and job creation.

There is a lot of discussion about homelessness. If you want to get the homeless off the street and the dole, we need to provide them with jobs and job training. This budget funds job training for the homeless.

We can get rid of crime and youth violence with jobs and job training. This budget funds a variety of programs to train young people. The young people of this Nation truly need these jobs this summer. We fund the Youth Fair Chance Program, a program that will get troubled young people back into the mainstream with education and jobs.

We have the best welfare reform in this budget for welfare recipients. Welfare recipients need jobs and job training. This budget does that. It also funds rent reform so that public housing recipients can go to work and get off welfare.

Many formerly middle-class workers now work in entry-level jobs because they have not learned new skills. This budget would invest in retraining and economic conversion so laid-off workers can learn a skill and return to jobs which provide a decent standard of living.

If you believe the private sector must lead the way in economic development, this budget would restore and expand funds for community development banks. Community development banks create small businesses. Small businesses create jobs. The best social program in the world is a job.

Finally, the Republican budget is the budget that protects the big corporate welfare interests, the Wall Street robber barons and the big corporate tax manipulators. The CBC budget is a budget of working people, the middle class, of children and the poor. Let's bring hope, not despair, to America. Support the CBC budget.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ].

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, we are down to two plans for balancing the budget, and one fundamental choice—Medicare, or CorporateCare. Do we fund tax breaks for the corporate America and the wealthy, or preserve

health benefits for the elderly? The Kasich budget chooses the wealthy; the caring majority budget chooses the seniors and working families.

The Republican budget rolls back Medicare benefits, ends college aid programs, and slashes spending for child nutrition.

Who gains—the rich. They get almost \$300 billion in tax breaks.

The caring majority budget stands on the side of the American people. It fully funds Medicare and Medicaid, stops backdoor attempts to cut Social Security, and invests billions more in education, job training, and job creation.

How do we do this—by closing tax loopholes for the rich, ending corporate welfare programs, and drafting the first sane, post-cold-war defense budget.

Republicans and Democrats both have plans for balancing the budget. The only difference is who benefits—the wealthy, or the working people of this country.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the budget proposal of the Congressional Black Caucus.

I am voting for this budget, not because I favor every detail, in fact there are choices that the authors of this budget have made to which I strongly object. However, the general trust of this budget is on target.

This is a balanced budget. It gets to balance through reasonable cuts in corporate welfare and reductions in waste at the Pentagon.

This budget protects Social Security and Medicare. And it provides for an increase in the most important investment we as a nation can make—education.

The Republican budget, on the other hand, gives a huge tax cut for profitable corporations and the wealthy. It actually increases military spending, while making deep cuts in Medicare. What's worse, it cuts Social Security cost of living adjustments, violating the promise made by Republican leaders.

The Republican budget is a prescription for the continued decline in living standards for working American families.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FATTAH].

(Mr. FATTAH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the CBC alternative budget.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, to close debate, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is yielded 4 minutes by the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlemen for their generosity on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Chairman, we come to the closing moments of this debate. Let me say, as I have said on more than one occasion, that today we engage in perhaps the most important function that a public servant can engage in, and, that is, the adoption of our national budget. Because I believe that our national budget is the best reflection of our national values. For one can determine the nature of our commitment to our future, to our populace, to our children, to our unfortunate, to our disadvantaged, to the less fortunate people in our society by a simple examination of our budgetary priorities.

The second point I would make, Mr. Chairman, is this: Every single budget that has come to the floor today, including the one before us now, balances the budget by the year 2002 that was the prerequisite that allowed any budget alternative to come to the floor.

Thus the debate, Mr. Chairman, is not whether one budget or the other balances but what road, what route, which direction, what values, what priorities are embraced by that national budget.

I am pleased to rise in support of the Congressional Black Caucus/Progressive Caucus budget because it is the only budget before this body that simultaneously does three things:

First, it provides for a comprehensive approach for the effective maintenance of our national security. Second, it provides for a civil investment program that allows all of us here to carry out our significant and important constitutional responsibilities to provide for the common good and to promote domestic tranquility. Third, it places us on the path of tax equity and tax fairness for all of our people.

In the moments I have remaining, let me focus on the issue of an effective national security strategy.

Mr. Chairman, it goes beyond simply placing billions of dollars in a huge military budget. I would submit that there are three elements of an effective national security strategy:

First, a healthy vibrant and vital economy and an able citizenry that is well-educated, well-trained and highly motivated to participate in the political process, allowing us to continue to struggle over the health of our economy, the quality of our lives and the vibrance of our institutions.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to how we address that, we must then fund, more than adequately, education, health, and job training. There must be a commitment to technological and infrastructure development. We must continue to remind ourselves of the significant contribution that comes to us by virtue of our investment in physical and social research, just to name a few.

The second element of an important national security strategy is a comprehensive, thoughtful, well-thought-out, well-funded foreign policy that does several things: promotes regional and international stability by working with our allies and other nations in the world. Second, to promote democracy and human rights, precluding internal conflicts that danger and threaten the security; and, third, to deter war, not by violence and militarism but by the use of diplomacy and other significant nonviolent tools that are at our disposal in the international arena as we carry out our international discourse.

Mr. Chairman, the third element is a sufficient military force to carry out our responsibilities in a rapidly changing world, to address the threats and the challenges that are out there.

I believe that the Congressional Black Caucus budget has done all of that.

Let me place this latter point in proper perspective: We are now, Mr. Chairman, in this country spending as much on our military budget, almost as much as every other Nation in the world combined spends on its national military budgets.

If you add our European allies and our Asian allies into that equation, our friends and the United States spend in excess of 80 percent of the world's military budget. Thus less than 20 percent can be designed to finance any of our potential adversaries.

Question: Why do we need so much money when the cold war is over?

To conclude quickly, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Congressional Black Caucus effort. It is magnificent as we move to enhance the quality of life for our children and our children's children.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, it is my distinct honor to yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], our majority leader.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] is recognized for 6½ minutes.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, let me begin by paying my respects to my friends in the Congressional Black Caucus. Once again as they do every year, they have brought together a budget; they have risen to the occasion and they have put good work into their effort.

Let me assure my friends, it is with a certain amount of regret that I must encourage Members not to vote for your budget, but my statements are made nevertheless in total respect for your good effort.

Mr. Chairman, this debate, this great debate over how and whether we balance the budget, should conclusively prove to America that real and fundamental change has come to the people's House.

For the first time in more than a quarter century, we are actually going to balance the budget of the United States.

Some here today have suggested that we should not; others have argued that we cannot, that the task is too difficult, the choices too tough.

I say to my colleagues, now is the time to stop robbing our children and grandchildren; now is the time, at last, for us to give up the false promise of big Government and deficit spending.

Now is the time to do what is right, to restore the American Dream.

This Republican Congress will neither gamble with the future of our children, nor break our bond with our seniors.

Today is an historic day, but we must keep it in historical perspective.

We just finished celebrating the 50th Anniversary of V-E Day. We honored the courage, the heroism, and the sacrifice of a generation that guaranteed our freedom, and restored liberty to Europe.

They faced far, far tougher foes than simple red ink.

Compared to their sacrifices on the beaches of Sicily, the cliffs of Normandy, and in the forests of the Bulge, our task pales by comparison.

Those brave Americans risked life and limb so that their children would live free. Today, that freedom is at risk again—not because of the military muscle of a foreign power, but because politicians didn't have the courage to do what we will do today.

This debate is about much more than dollars and cents or dueling charts and graphs.

It is about morality; about whether or not one generation will continue cheating the next.

If our children are to live as freely, as proudly, and as happily as we live, then it is time to quit the political posturing and balance the budget.

Will our task be difficult? Things worth doing usually are.

Will it cause discomfort? Freedom sometimes does.

Will it require courage? That is what being American is all about.

Let us suffer no illusions. Those who fear change, those who profit from the status quo, those who have ruled Washington for decades, will fight us at every turn.

Today, the party that once rallied the Nation with "we have nothing to fear but fear itself," has nothing to offer but fear itself.

But the politics of fear never works in America, because America is a Nation of optimists.

Americans want a smaller Government. They demand tax relief. And they reject business as usual.

Now it is up to us. For, today we must decide what kind of a Nation we will be.

We can, as some in this body and in the White House have suggested, do nothing. We can keep on spending, and spending, and spending, giving no thought to what it will do to our future, our families, and our Nation.

Or we can pass the Kasich budget, restore the American Dream, and head into the 21st century with our heads

high, our fiscal house in order optimistic, and full of hope.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to vote for freedom, hope, and vote for responsibility. Vote for the Kasich budget.

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget. This budget demonstrates a commitment to the American people. We will not sit idly by and merely cringe at the possibility that money will be taken out of the homes, and food off the tables, of millions of Americans.

The CBC budget calls for spending much less on defense than the Republican proposal. The disproportionate ratio of defense spending to domestic investment is outdated. Believe it or not, we are at peace. We must have the courage to go further in investing in our human capital.

Those who can least afford cuts—the poor, American children, and the elderly—should not be required to bear the brunt of the Republican agenda. I ask Mr. Chairman, is human life not more important than big business? The CBC alternative budget calls on corporations to bear their fair share of the burden.

The CBC alternative budget will invest in the programs people really need. Funding for Medicare and Medicaid will be maintained. In addition, education and job training will take high priority.

We must again invest in our people and their institutions. This investment will stimulate economic growth and promote the democratic ideal of human dignity. Our conscience mandates that we do no less.

I stand before you today on behalf of the tens of millions of Americans who cannot stand for themselves. For them, I ask my colleagues to balance this country's need for fiscal responsibility with compassion for those Americans who work hard every day but who are still unable to provide for their families; elderly Americans who have worked hard their entire lives only to be told by members of the majority party that Medicare is being abolished to provide tax breaks for the wealthy; and the millions of American youth who rely on summer jobs to help care for their families and keep them off the streets.

I stand today to plead with my colleagues to consider the severe consequences of failing to provide for important programs like Headstart and Summer Youth Employment. Headstart helps ensure that million of poor children in this country will receive the opportunity for a basic education. And Mr. Chairman, I don't have to remind this body of the critical state of education in America. Headstart is the best start we can give to our youth, who alone will determine the future course of this great Nation. By providing our youth with summer jobs, we provide them with an alternative to the tragic influences of crime that so terribly plagues our Nation's cities. I would remind my colleagues that it costs million less to offer summer jobs than to build and maintain prisons. This is a program that just plain makes sense.

I further plead with my colleagues to remember that this Nation's greatest asset is compassion. As we vote on the most important piece of legislation in this Congress, I ask my colleagues to not only show compassion but vision, for without this vision, Mr. Chairman, our Nation shall surely perish.

I urge my colleagues to support the Payne-Owens/Black Caucus substitute.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the budget for the caring majority offered by Mr. PAYNE and Mr. OWENS.

As I mentioned yesterday, this entire process is flawed because every alternative presented to the House must balance the budget by fiscal year 2002, which some economists fear would pull resources out of the economy too abruptly. The Payne-Owens substitute was developed within this artificial restraint.

But the Payne-Owens substitute is by far the best of the proposals before us today. Its assumptions are far fairer than those behind the other proposals, increasing revenues as well as cutting spending and putting defense on the table along with domestic programs. It protects essential Federal functions from the budget axe and makes needed investments in our Nation's future.

On the revenue side, the substitute would give individuals an income tax credit to offset 20 percent of Social Security payroll taxes—a major, if necessary, burden on working families.

Revenues would come from increasing certain corporate and business taxes, eliminating certain tax subsidies for businesses, and raising the tax rate on capital gains.

On the spending side, the Payne-Owens substitute would cut defense spending to a level more in line with the world we're living in today, while providing the resources to continue our role in international affairs.

It would protect Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid and increase our investments in education and training programs.

It would continue the crucial Federal role in public health and biomedical research and further our commitment to a cleaner environment and to biological diversity.

It would address the failings of our welfare system by maintaining Medicaid, AFDC, and school lunch as entitlements, creating jobs, and increasing support for child care.

It would balance violent crime enforcement programs by strengthening prevention and increase funding for juvenile justice, weed and seed, drug courts, and ounce of prevention.

Mr. Chairman, this is the best alternative before the House today. It would bring our Federal budget into balance in fiscal year 2002 without making the Federal Government unable to protect the Nation's health, safety, and environment, or provide a safety net for the most vulnerable of our people.

I urge my colleagues to support the Payne-Owens substitute and, if it does not pass, to oppose the Republican budget.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of veterans and the elderly and in support of the Congressional Black Caucus budget.

Our seniors who rely so heavily on Medicare and Medicaid will be especially hard hit by Republican budgets. Hurting seniors and destroying veterans health care is the Republican plan for America. Claude Pepper, a true champion of the elderly, would be outraged with the attempt to reduce Medicare and Medicaid to second-rate health care systems so Republicans can pay for a \$355 billion tax cut for the wealthy.

Veterans fair no better than seniors in the cruel Republican budget. Republican budget cuts destroy the heart of VA programs. VA's health care system suffers from years of

underfunding; many of its facilities are old and in need of repair. Gutting construction funds to update VA's infrastructure will destroy veterans's health care—especially in Florida where almost 100 new veterans arrive daily.

The Congressional Black Caucus budget is good for America's majority, for the elderly, and veterans. It increases the President's fiscal year 1996 budget for veterans by \$175.3 million. It includes increases for medical care and homeless programs, and recommends new construction funding for VA medical centers to meet increasing needs. This caring majority budget remembers veterans—and not just on Memorial Day. It also remembers the elderly.

□ 1500

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 56, noes 367, answered “present” 1, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 344]

AYES—56

Becerra
Bonior
Brown (FL)
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Coyne
DeFazio
Dellums
Dixon
Engel
Fattah
Fields (LA)
Filner
Foglietta
Ford

Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Green
Hastings (FL)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Jackson-Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Lewis (GA)
Martinez
McDermott
McKinney
Meek
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mink
Nadler
Oberstar
Owens

Payne (NJ)
Rangel
Reynolds
Sabó
Sanders
Scott
Serrano
Stark
Stokes
Thompson
Torres
Tucker
Velazquez
Waters
Watt (NC)
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOES—367

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bilely
Blute

Boehlt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambless
Chapman

Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich

Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Meehan
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Moakley
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Paxton
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen

Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Siskisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Trafcant
Upton
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wyden
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Bishop

NOT VOTING—10

| | | |
|--------|------------|--------|
| Archer | Livingston | Towns |
| Berman | McNulty | Waxman |
| Flake | Mollohan | |
| Klecza | Rush | |

□ 1522

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Rush for, with Mr. McNulty against.

Ms. PELOSI changed her vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BONO. Mr. Chairman, on today I missed the following votes: On rollcall No. 342, Gephardt, substitute, I would have voted "no," on rollcall No. 343, Neumann substitute, I would have voted "no," and on rollcall No. 344, Payne substitute, I would have voted "no."

The CHAIRMAN. The only further amendment in order under House Resolution 149 is an amendment in the nature of a substitute by the minority leader or his designee, based upon a revised budget submission by the President, if printed in the RECORD by the minority leader not later than May 17, 1995. Such an amendment was not so printed. Consequently, no further amendment is in order.

Pursuant to the rule, a final period of general debate is now in order.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of the measure.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the budget resolution offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], and in opposition to the alternative budget resolutions to be offered on the floor today.

I congratulate the chairman of the Budget Committee for his outstanding, groundbreaking leadership in putting together this budget resolution, helping all of us carry out our promises to bring our budget into balance. None of us want to leave our children and grandchildren an inheritance of debt; we want to leave them a better way of life and we will.

As Chairman KASICH knows better than any of us, this is not easy work and in many ways it is painful. Despite my support for the international affairs function programs, I also support this resolution, even though international affairs spending will go down, sharply, over the next few years.

The leadership has come together in this agreement resolution to support the same funding levels for international affairs.

Those levels are realistic: we are supporting programs that are necessary to the national security and the overall national interest of the United States. We will all stand together against further cuts in spending on those programs in the course of voting on this resolution. We've been facing these same issues in our Committee on International Relations, where appropriations for most of these programs are authorized.

Last Monday night, our committee ordered reported legislation that reduces—I repeat reduces—fiscal year 1996 spending on programs within our jurisdiction by \$1 billion compared to fiscal year 1995 appropriations, that is, from \$18.4 billion to \$17.4 billion.

In 1997, it authorizes spending of \$15.2 billion, for a cut of \$1.6 billion compared to 1995. And it does even more—it steps off the process of cutting back on Government agencies by ending the independent existence of the Agency for International Development, the U.S. Information Agency, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. When this resolution is adopted, and our American Overseas Interests Act comes to the floor next week, it will be brought into full conformity with the discretionary budget authority targets applicable to our committee.

At that time, we will again stand together with our leadership in support of sharply reduced, prudent, but necessary funding that supports our national interests.

To elaborate further with regard to my reasons for supporting this resolution, it should be underscored that it will provide for a balanced Federal budget within 7 years—by fiscal year 2002—by cutting the deficit by a total of \$1.1 trillion. This will be achieved through cuts in both discretionary and mandatory spending programs.

Additionally, H. Con. Res. 67 would allow for an increase in funding to strengthen important defense programs. The cold war may be over, but the world is still a dangerous place.

Although I am voting in favor of the budget resolution, I am concerned about its impact on our Nation's seniors. Though it is important that the Medicare system be reformed due to its impending bankruptcy in the year 2002, the Budget Committee's proposal will cut an estimated \$22.5 billion from Medicare in New York State. Accordingly, we must make certain that those reforms do not place undue hardships on our Nation's senior citizens. Therefore, I believe that cuts in the program should not affect current recipients of Medicare. Instead, the changes should be in place for future recipients.

Additionally, I recommend means testing the Medicare Program. Those seniors who can afford to pay more for their health care should do so.

I am hopeful that we can work out a Medicare reform proposal throughout this budget process which can accomplish both saving Medicare from bankruptcy while at the same time protecting our Nation's seniors. I look forward to working with my colleagues in that regard.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to vote in support of a budget resolution which will provide for a balanced budget for the first time since 1969.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I also rise in support of the Kasich amendment.

Mr. Chairman, on the issue of Medicare and Medicaid, which my colleagues on the other side of the aisle claim we are going to cut, I want to read a quote:

Today, Medicaid and Medicare are going up at three times the rate of inflation. We propose to let it go up at two times the rate of inflation. That is not a Medicare or Medicaid cut. We are going to have increases in Medicare and Medicaid, but a reduction in the rate of growth.

I venture to say you might be surprised to learn that these words were spoken not by Republicans, but by the President last year when he was trying to sell his health care package to the American people.

Thus far the debate on making changes to insure the solvency of Medicare has been less than statesmanlike. In fact, at times it has been just plain nasty and mean-spirited. We live in a high-technology country where words spoken by a major political figure can reach a wide audience. I think we should all pause and think before we make statements that are simply untrue and at times even outrageous.

Those who are quick to criticize and condemn what we are trying to do to save Medicare and Medicaid should exercise a little caution. There is no need to let loose with inflammatory statements that could alarm the most vulnerable segments of the population in our country, namely the elderly, the infirmed, and women and children. It is wrong and think frankly ignoble to do so.

I think it is a disgrace that some of my colleagues have likened what we are attempting to do to the actions of Hitler during the Holocaust. I find it repugnant that they would point an accusatory finger and insinuate that through the Contract With America we are waging a war on our children. Nothing could be further from the truth.

I don't remember hearing this type of rhetoric last year when the First Lady said "We feel confident—that we can reduce the rate of increase in Medicare without undermining quality for Medicare recipients." What a difference a year makes. Now, administration officials are singing a different tune. Recently, Secretary Shalala said: "Our argument is that if you're slowing down growth here, and that's below what's happening in terms of costs out there, it's a real cut." So, when the president proposed slowing down the rate of growth in Medicare and Medicaid it wasn't a cut, but now that our budget contains a similar proposal, it is a cut.

It is ironic that the administration is now saying that Republicans don't care about the poor and needy because we want to reform Medicare and Medicaid. When the administration was proposing similar changes would they have accepted the label mean-spirited?

Regardless of whether there is a balanced budget, there is an undeniable, urgent need to make certain reforms to avert the Medicare trust fund's looming bankruptcy. Let's put our differences aside and work in a bipartisan manner to solve the problems of how to save the Medicare Program and how to reform Medicaid so that it delivers the necessary care in a more cost-effective manner. I believe we

are up to the task and I plan to work with my colleagues in Committee and here in Congress to achieve this goal.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER].

(Mr. SCHAEFER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kasich budget amendment.

Mr. Chairman, today the Republican Party is following through on its promise to propose a budget that complies with the balanced budget amendment sponsored by my good friend CHARLIE STENHOLM and I, this House passed at the beginning of the year.

This is a serious budget resolution with no gimmicks that calls the bluff of those who said we could not or would not propose a balanced budget.

Now, I doubt there is a single Member of Congress that supports absolutely every provision of this resolution. Personally, I am concerned by the proposal to eliminate the Department of Energy.

The notion that eliminating this Department will result in huge savings is simply not correct. Most of the functions of the Department will have to continue—the nuclear weapons complex, for example, will still have to operate. The Environmental Management Program will still exist. Congress cannot eliminate these functions.

The Reagan administration ran into these same difficulties in the early 1980's. The final analysis of dismantling DOE indicated that there would be little, if any, cost savings in the long run, and that in the short run, it would actually cost more money to shut down the Department than leaving it alone.

Significant savings do exist in the Department's programs. There is no doubt of that. The DOE, by its own estimation, will be able to save over \$14 billion over the next 5 years—a significant reduction. It also will have eliminated 27 percent of its work force. These are real cuts, and real savings for American taxpayers. The overall savings, in my opinion, will be greater by keeping DOE whole and accountable than by parceling out its responsibilities to a range of other Government agencies.

Of course, every issue addressed in the budget resolution will ultimately be decided by the appropriate authorizing committees. I look forward to the debate over this matter.

I urge my colleagues to support the Kasich budget resolution.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, on this last vote, I was in the Chamber. I had my card in the machine. I pushed the button twice, but it did not do anything. I ran down here in order to vote, and you closed the vote off. Before I got in, the clerks on the outside yelled, "One more, one more." I came in and yelled again, "One more, one more," and I was not allowed to vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's statement will appear in the RECORD.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it would be in order for the gentleman to be given an opportunity to vote "yes" on the next vote in order to make up for the "yes" he did not get to cast on the last vote?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair declines to rule on that.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, on this last vote, I would have voted "yes" resoundingly.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a statement for the record. On the last recorded vote on the amendment, rollcall 344, I believe it is, I inadvertently voted "no"; my intention was to vote "yes" on that amendment.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the distinguished minority leader.

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, this vote that we are about to take is perhaps the most important vote of the 2-year period that we will serve in the House of Representatives, and for a moment I would like you to take out of your mind all of the charts and all of the graphs and all of the numbers and all of the statistics that we have flooded the floor with and the airwaves with over the last 2 days and to remember that when we pass a budget, unlike anything else we do here, we affect the lives of millions of our people, all of our people.

I would like you to focus on a picture, 70-year-old Cecil Whitner and his wife Ethel, from Affton, MO. All of his life, Cecil has served his country and his community. He fought five major battles in World War II, and he was rewarded with the Bronze Star for his bravery in action.

For more than three decades, he worked as a meatcutter in a grocery store in St. Louis. He always paid his taxes, he paid his Medicare taxes, he paid his Social Security taxes, he did what this society asked him to do, as did his wife.

□ 1530

Now that he is retired on disability and over 70, he depends every month on Social Security and Medicare, on the money that he paid into these programs for more than 35 years.

I say to my colleagues, this budget that you are about to vote on would take approximately \$1,300 by the year 2002 between Medicare costs and this pension from Social Security from their annual income, \$1,300. It would be one thing if what we are asking them to do was to simply balance the budget, but it is not. In addition to allegedly balancing the budget, we are taking in \$1,300 from these folks so that we can give a \$20,000 a year tax break to families earning \$350,000 a year or more.

I would like to show my colleagues another picture, a younger family. In this picture we see Gina Stacer, whose husband, Roy, works as a car salesman in St. Louis. They are trying to save desperately for their twins' education as well as for their own retirement, but

I say to my colleagues, when you live paycheck to paycheck, as most of our people do, that's pretty hard to do. Gina's parents are both retired, and they pay astronomical medical bills with Medicare and Social Security. But this budget would cut those benefits, and Gina and Roy would have to use their savings, not to build their children's future—they would like to go to college—but to have to protect their parents' lives.

I say to my colleagues, these issues that you vote on today are not just the issues of the elderly. They are issues that affect every American and every American family. Young people who are working have a responsibility to take care of their parents, and they take that responsibility very seriously, and, if their parents are in trouble with medical bills, or they cannot support themselves on Social Security, and if they are living on Social Security, then they have got to step into the breach, and, as all of you know, these middle-income families and families trying to get in the middle income are already pressed without having to do what this budget would ask them to do.

Now in the final analysis this budget is about our values. It is about what we believe is right and wrong, just and decent, and I urge my colleagues to understand that as they vote that they are not voting for just charts, and graphs, and numbers. They are voting for flesh-and-blood people who depend on us to represent them in this most important of all transactions that we do as a people. The value of my party, and I hope of a lot in the other party, is that we must invest in people for the things that they cannot do for themselves.

All of us believe our budget must be brought into balance. All of us believe we have got to get our fiscal accounts in order. It is the question of how to do it, and what I argue to my colleagues is, if we're going to balance the budget, let's figure out how to balance the budget, but in that toughest of all transactions let us not represent a value that says we're going to take money from middle-income people who are already struggling, \$1,300 a year, to give a \$20,000 a year tax cut to families who are earning \$350,000 a year.

I realize the value that says we must invest in people who already have it made, and that investment will make its way down to the middle class eventually, but I believe as public servants we have a duty, a responsibility, in justice and decency and for what is right, to continue to make the needed investment in the people of this country, which is the greatest resource of this country, and let the people who have it made continue to make their contributions to this great society as well.

Defeat this resolution. We can do better.

The CHAIRMAN. All time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] has expired.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, to close this historic debate I consider it my great privilege and honor to yield my time to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, a person who has done yeoman work on this.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] for 5 minutes.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, we have seen a lot of pictures. I say, "I want to show you, America—I want to show you the future. I want to show you who we're doing this for."

We have seen a lot of pictures. Katie Nunn—a little baby—and her mother who is here says she wants her baby to be able to fly someday like all of us can, spread our wings, and dream and become what we want to become. That is what this is all about today.

The first thing I want to do is I want to talk about the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO]. MARTIN SABO is as class an act as we can find in public life. He is a wonderful human being.

I love MARTIN because he has fought the good fight, and he is a man of conviction, and a man of courage, and a man of principle. He will be a friend of mine forever.

I also want to take a minute to salute the pioneers. Remember when they went over the mountains, and they broke the wheel, and they struggled to make it work in the rain, and against attacks and disease? That pioneer is PETE DOMENICI. He is a Senator from New Mexico.

I want to thank somebody who is not here today. I am sure he is probably watching, and he does not agree with all the details, but he is a guy that proved that two sides can come together, they can reach agreement. It is my dream someday we will all be able to have a bipartisan effort. His name is Tim Penny. Tim Penny is a man of conscience.

I want to thank the Budget staff who worked day and night, 28 of them. I mean 28 of them going through \$12 trillion worth of spending. They are phenomenal, and they dream, and they are being rewarded today.

And I want to thank, most importantly, my colleagues on the Committee on the Budget, the tip of the spear for the revolution, and I want to talk a little bit about the revolution, and this is what I said to MARTIN the other night:

"My dad was a Roosevelt Democrat. No matter how long his son was in politics, no matter how long I talked to him, my dad remained a Roosevelt Democrat because he believed that the Democrat Party stood up for folks, and I want to tell you that over the last 40 years, whether it was civil rights and the need for this country to begin to heal itself, and it is still not healed, or whether it was education or Medicare for our senior citizens, frankly the Federal Government giving opportunity for people to fly, the Democrat Party did it."

I say to my colleagues that life is about balance. Talk about Neil Armstrong going to the Moon; it was about balance. The pendulum has swung so far to Washington solving problems that people in America have been saying, "I've given too much money, I've given too much control, I've given too much influence to Washington, and frankly I can do it better in my neighborhood. I want to do it better in my neighborhood. I want to educate my children the way I want to educate them. I want to feed them. I want to show compassion to people who are in need."

Mr. Chairman, where I came from, in McKees Rocks, it was a simple little thing. It was a sin not to help somebody in need. It was equally a sin to help people who should help themselves.

And what our vision is for the 21st century is a vision of taking power, and money, and control and influence from this city and giving it back to the men and women all across this country in every city, in every town, in every village in this country, and saying, "We believe in you, and we trust you."

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues, "As we go into the 21st century, and you think that an individual can sit in their home with a magical instrument, a magical invention called a computer, and move the financial markets of the world, doesn't it make sense, as we go into the 21st century, that the 21st century is about the power of the individual, not the power of bureaucracy, not the power of redtape, because frankly the power of bureaucracy, and redtape, and misplaced compassion does not reward individual achievement and, in some respects, takes away the incentives for the individual to fly."

Look at the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME]. The man came from very tough surroundings, was the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus. Do my colleagues know why? Because America is a place of opportunity, and that is what this is all about. It is about balancing a budget and stopping the flow of red ink because, just like a family, if Government will spend day in and day out more than what it takes in, it will bankrupt itself, it will create no growth, and do my colleagues know what the worst thing about no growth is? The rich get richer and the poor get poorer, and it is my dream for everybody to be able to fly in America.

Alan Greenspan said to us, and I have listened to many hours of testimony, but when Alan Greenspan came before the Committee on the Budget and said, "If we can balance the budget, we will unleash a prosperity that we cannot even chart with this precious American system, and that gnawing fear in the guts of mothers and fathers and that their children will not be better off than them can finally be destroyed." That is what this is about today.

I say to my colleagues, "It's about facing hard issues, it's about having to

stare somebody square in the eye and say, 'I'd love to help you, but I got to put the kids first, and if there is a political risk, I'm prepared to absorb it,' because in the long run we're going to lift this country."

I mean what is a better quote than John Kennedy saying, "A rising tide lifts all boats?" That is what this is.

And about tax cuts let me just say, "If there is any institution that ought to be reinforced into the 21st century, it's the American family." We all know that.

□ 1545

What we are doing is we are saying that as we cut Government, as we end duplication, we are going to reward the family into the 21st century, and all the things that the family represents, value, stability, hope, capital gains, we did not hate rich people where I came from. I have said it before. Only guilty rich people do not like the rich. What capital gains is about is a funnel. Prosperity. You have got a jug of prosperity in one hand and a funnel in another. And when the stem is too narrow, you try to pour prosperity in, and it overflows, and the Fed says raise interest rates and slow everything down.

Capital gains is about widening the stem. It is about taking that jug of prosperity that is jobs and progress and it is pouring it through that funnel as fast as we possibly can, so everyone can share in the bounty of this country. That is what it is about.

I want to say to my friends who may vote against this, we are going to do this now. We are going to bring the pendulum back, and we have our vision for emphasizing the individual. That does not mean the Government does not have a role. It does. And I know how many of you have worked and bled and fought for the things that you believe in. And as we as Republicans begin to put this plan together, as we march down this road to saving America, I am going to urge everybody to keep their minds and their ears and their eyes open about how we can do it right.

But, ladies and gentlemen, it has to be done. We have to preserve this great country of ours. And it is a historic moment, when all of us can stand up for the future, we can all stand up for America.

Pass the resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would request the gentleman to remove references to persons in the gallery and on the floor.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, in the early 1950's, Adlai Stevenson quipped that Republicans, in general, had to be dragged screaming into the 20th century. It appears to me, that the President and the Democrat leadership in the House, will have to be dragged screaming into the 21st century if ever a balanced Federal Budget is to be achieved.

It is amazing how the President—in the face of almost \$5 trillion of debt and over \$300 billion of annual interest accruing on that debt—

can still refuse to even offer a balanced budget for either this century or the next.

And the minority leadership in the House also resists endorsing any such balanced budget plan. For each of the last 25 years, that leadership—representing the majority control of this body, steadfastly piled up nothing but unbalanced budgets. And now—when the only issue being debated is not whether there should be a balanced budget over the next 5 or 7 years—still the President and his party's leadership in the House—fiddle while others present balanced budgets—including a coalition of Democrat House Members who recognize that—like it or not—the hard choices have to be made and a balanced budget must be achieved.

It is ironic that if the Democrat leadership in the 104th Congress had given recognition to Members like Tim Penney and others within their ranks—who tried to change the calamitous fiscal policies of the big spenders of his party, probably the Democrats would still control this Chamber. It is utterly mystifying however that the Democrat leadership can still resist constructing a balanced budget as we prepare to enter the 21st century. Alas, all they can do is to criticize those who are responsibly creating balanced budget plans.

If they will not lead, they must follow; or, more accurately, in the words of Adlai Stevenson, they must be dragged screaming into the 21st Century.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote against this bill.

I have important objections to a bill that ties disaster relief—which I support—to slash-and-burn spending cuts.

The Republican strategy is transparent. It's political gamesmanship.

Saving money, cutting the deficit: these are principles I can support.

But we shouldn't tie the wholesale destruction of programs that help students and working Americans to disaster relief for quake-ravaged Los Angeles, bomb-damaged Oklahoma City, and the flood impacted people of my district.

Let's address these issues separately. Let's reject this callous Republican strategy.

Let's vote on disaster aid, then let's get down to business, and see where we can cut spending.

I hope the American people pay close attention to this debate, and this process. The Republicans have developed a bad habit. They say one thing, but they do another.

They promised to address the budget deficit. In fact, the Republican conferees who crafted this bill dropped a Democratic amendment that would have required that the net savings from this bill—\$9 billion—be used to pay down the deficit.

Instead, the Republicans intend to use these savings as their private slush fund to finance a tax break for the privileged few.

Instead of cracking down on corporate tax giveaways, and special interest loopholes, the Republicans cracked down on seniors, students, and everybody who didn't have access to high-priced lobbyists.

Let me highlight just one glaring example. The Senate version of this bill included a provision to eliminate a tax loophole that allowed billionaire expatriates to avoid paying taxes. But the Republican leadership rejected this provision and stripped this language from the conference report.

In fact, this bill typifies the callousness with which the Republicans have addressed our Nation's fundamental problems.

The Republican rescissions bill would devastate—if not eliminate—programs that help at-risk, disadvantaged kids.

Republican targets include:

The Safe and Drug Free Schools Program. Because of Republican cuts, our schools and communities will have \$200 million less to combat drugs and violence on campus and in the classroom.

The Goals 2000 Program. Higher academic standards help everyone: students, parents, and employers. But this national program takes a \$90 million hit in the Republican bill. This was worked out with our Nation's Governors.

The School-to-Work Program. By matching classroom learning to on-the-job training, we can make sure that students get the help they need to enter today's workforce. But wait. The Republicans cut funding from this program—crippling a program that has drawn positive reviews from corporate participants and school-kids alike.

America can be a strong, productive Nation if we have the courage and commitment to educate our citizens. Without access to education and training, our workforce cannot compete in an economy that demands new skills and sets new rules.

The evidence is compelling. We can't afford to give up this fight.

Since 1979, most working Americans have lost ground. For everybody but the very wealthy, incomes have barely kept up with inflation. Overall household income increased by nearly \$800 billion between 1979 and 1993, yet, almost 97 percent of this increase went to the top 20 percent of American households.

We can't raise wages if we don't give students and working Americans the tools they need to succeed.

A recent study prepared by the Census Bureau documents the direct and positive link between education and productivity. The report found that a better educated work-force can significantly increase productivity.

Let's attack the education deficit with the same intensity we attack the budget deficit. Providing educational opportunity and maintaining fiscal responsibility—these aren't mutually exclusive goals.

I urge my Republican colleagues to open a dialogue with the administration. Let's work out a compromise that we can be proud of and the American people can be proud of.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my strongest opposition to this budget resolution. This budget proposes to eliminate the Federal deficit by 2002, yet gives a tax cut to the wealthiest Americans. While we must work toward a balanced budget, we must do so responsibly. We must not force those most in need to bear the burden of balancing the budget alone.

In this budget, the House Republicans have chosen to take away health and financial security to seniors in order to achieve tremendous tax breaks to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans. While the Republican budget proposes to make millions of seniors pay an additional \$1,060 in out-of-pocket Medicare expenses each year, it provides a tax windfall of \$20,000 per year for Americans with incomes over \$350,000.

This bill is a direct assault on our Nation's seniors. In addition to the Medicare cuts, the

Republicans are also planning to cut Social Security benefits to seniors, which would result in an average reduction of \$240 in benefits for individual seniors in 2002.

The Republicans said their budget would make tough choices and they were right—their choices will be tough on millions of seniors who rely on Medicare and Social Security.

But seniors are not the only victims of this misguided budget scheme. The Republican budget would make educational opportunity a thing of the past for many middle class students and their families.

It is appalling that the Republican budget cuts student loans by \$18.7 billion by charging students interest on their loans while they are still in school. This will increase the cost of a higher education by approximately \$5,000 for every student receiving a loan to finance a college education. Is this the Republican opportunity society?

The Republican plan to terminate many very crucial programs that provide the most basic assistance to those most in need is similarly appalling. Some of the many programs devastated by this budget include: Housing Opportunities for People with AIDS; the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program [LIHEAP], which ensures low-income Americans, including seniors, access to heat during the cold winter months; unemployment insurance extension benefits; and job training and education programs. The list goes on and on. This resolution also dramatically undermines Americas' access to the arts and humanities by cutting the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and the National Endowment for the Arts, and the Endowment for the Humanities.

The inequities in this Republican budget are blatant and outrageous. This budget requires those most in need to shoulder the burden of balancing the budget, while granting the wealthiest of Americans a windfall.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is unfair, it is unjust, and must be voted down. I ask my colleagues to reject the budget resolution.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the budget resolution we are voting on today.

I am particularly appalled that this measure would rob our senior citizens of their Medicare coverage and Social Security benefits in order to pay for tax breaks . . . something we cannot afford.

Mr. Chairman, I supported a balanced budget amendment and I am prepared to make the tough choices necessary to stop the flow of red ink. Indeed I'm voting for the Stenholm alternative budget which would actually cut more than the Republican proposal and direct these cuts to deficit reduction.

We all have to make sacrifices to achieve a balanced budget, but the Republican plan is clearly out of balance when it comes to fairness and protecting the most vulnerable members of our society.

What does this Republican proposal really mean? It means that out-of-pocket Medicare costs for seniors will increase by \$1,060 in 2002 and \$3,500 over the next 7 years while Social Security payments will be up to \$240 less. It means that students will have to pay on average \$5,000 more for their college loans. It means less money for our veterans, public hospitals, public broadcasting, and NIH Research.

And guess what it also means? It means that the very richest will have \$20,000 more to

spend each year thanks to the Republicans' tax breaks.

Like the Republican budget, the Stenholm budget resolution I support achieves a balanced budget in 2002. The difference is that the Stenholm resolution takes the \$281 billion in tax breaks and puts them back into Medicare, student loans, veterans hospitals, and other worthy expenditures which benefit the middle class and needy Americans.

I can't say that the cuts in the Stenholm budget are painless—they aren't. That's why I urge my colleagues to make responsible choices during the reconciliation process because that's where the rubber really meets the road.

In particular, I strongly believe that deep cuts in Medicare and Medicaid should not take place outside the context of systemic health care reform.

The Medicare program will not become insolvent because of mismanagement—in fact, administrative costs in Medicare represent about 3 percent of the overall program, lower than any private payor.

Rather, Medicare costs have increased because the overall costs of health care have skyrocketed and more people are enrolling in the system.

My constituents are concerned about health care costs and the deficit because they know that these issues will only continue to place larger burdens on their children. They support student loans because they know that these are investments in our future. They support nutrition programs, and public television because they provide nourishment for the body and the mind. And they support NIH Research because they see the connection between basic science and cures and treatments for the diseases which plague our society.

We can not blindly slash these programs without giving thought to what these programs really mean for the people we represent.

So in closing, Mr. Chairman, I would ask my colleagues to think beyond balancing numbers when they vote this afternoon: They should think about balancing austerity and fairness. By this measure, the Stenholm budget proposal is balanced while the Republican plan is not.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, today we are being presented with four alternative budget resolutions—two offered by the Majority and two by the Minority. For the first time in a quarter century, each of the resolutions before us would result in a balanced Federal budget. Each resolution recognizes that our current pattern of runaway spending is both economically unsustainable and morally indefensible. Each resolution presents us with very difficult, even painful choices; they are not ones that we relish making today or that we will relish making in the future. But the bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that we will have to make them—and postponing them won't make them any easier.

Let us consider a few facts. Our national debt stands at \$4.8 trillion—that is \$18,460 owed by every man, woman, and child in our Nation. Interest on our debt is the fastest-growing part of the Federal budget; in fact, each year, the Federal Government spends 15 cents of every dollar—or more than \$200 billion—just on interest on the debt. That is almost as much as we spend on all non-defense discretionary programs combined—on education, job training, medical research, and

much more. If current trends are not abated, interest and entitlement obligations will continue to grow exponentially until there is little left for anything else. Our choice today, then, is not about whether to balance the budget; it is about how we balance it.

This morning, I voted on the budget resolution offered by Democratic Representatives CHARLES STENHOLM and BILL ORTON. The Stenholm-Orton budget would have cut defense expenditures by \$60 billion more than the committee resolution, and it would have cut domestic expenditures by \$60 billion less. In addition, the Stenholm-Orton budget would not have funded a tax cut, would not have increased contributions to civil service retirement, would not have cut the student loan program, and it would have curbed the growth in Medicare more modestly than the committee resolution. Unfortunately the Stenholm-Orton resolution was defeated by a wide margin.

Given the defeat of this resolution, and due to the paramount importance of putting our Nation on a glidepath to a balanced budget, I will support the Budget Committee's resolution. While I have concerns about some aspects of the Committee budget, I believe that these concerns can be addressed in a House-Senate conference, and that the budget process must move forward. In fact, given the prevailing sentiment in the Senate, it is my expectation that the final document produced by House and Senate conferees will be very similar to the Stenholm-Orton budget for which I voted today: It will contain deeper defense cuts, more domestic cuts, and few, if any, tax cuts.

Mr. Chairman, a budget on a path to balance—however imperfect that path may be—is preferable to one that saddles future generations with hundreds of billions of dollars of debt each year. In addition, we must remember that a budget resolution is a blueprint, not a fully binding document, and that the authorizing and appropriating committees will have final discretion in determining how funds are spent in each budget category. That is why I will continue to work with these committees to protect our national priorities—education, health care, equity for our civil service, and much more, as I have done throughout my service in Congress.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today on this historic occasion to express my strong support for the Republican Budget. This budget represents a contract with our children. For too long Congress has thoughtlessly spent away the prosperity of our children to satisfy its appetite to spend.

I see Members get up who are opposed to this balanced budget plan claiming that passage of this plan will result in the end of civilization as we know it. They say that the elimination of this program and that program will cause undue harm to this Nation. Well I stand here today and say that if we do nothing then we will be responsible for undue harm to our children and our grandchildren. How compassionate will we have been to our children when in 30 years there is no money left for student loans, no money left for Head Start, and no money left for anything else. Why? Because every dollar that the Federal Government brings in will be eaten up by interest on the debt.

It pains me to see the Federal Government spend over \$250 billion per year in interest payments on the Federal debt. That money

funds nothing—no education, no military, no Medicare, and no Social Security. Enough is enough.

We are balancing the budget to ensure that we build a future for our children that is free of debt and full of opportunity. My son and daughter deserve nothing less. I can think of no greater responsibility as a father than to do this for my children. I ask that everyone look inside themselves, think of America's children, and support the Republican budget.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, today is a day that I almost thought would never come in my time here in Congress. Today I will be voting for a budget resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 67, which will put this Congress on a path toward balancing the federal budget. I have voted for such resolutions in the past only to see them trounced on the floor of the House. What makes today so special for me is that a majority of my colleagues in the House of Representatives will be joining me in voting for this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, for the first time since I came to this House in 1969, a majority of Members of this House agree that we must substantially shrink the size of government in the effort to balance the budget. We are not going to raise taxes, we are not going to use budget gimmicks, we are actually going to cut spending in an effort to slow the rate of growth of the Federal Government. Congress is finally acting in a fiscally responsible manner. The manner in which Congress has acted in the past can be described as selfish at best and criminal at worst. In my view, the debt that past Congresses have heaped upon future generations has been a criminal act. It can be characterized as criminal because that approach was mortgaging the future of our children and grandchildren. In short, Congress has spent money we did not have and sent the bill to our kids. This new Congress is saying enough is enough, and I could not be prouder than I am to be a part of this historic day in the House of Representatives.

Finally, I would like to commend my friend, the chairman of the Budget Committee, JOHN KASICH, for all his hard work and dedication in making this day possible. I remember campaigning for JOHN when he first ran for office and it was clear to me then that he was committed to principle and committed to the concept of fiscal responsibility. The House of Representatives and the people of this country are very fortunate to have JOHN KASICH as chairman of the Budget Committee, and we all owe him a debt of gratitude for his efforts.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support House Concurrent Resolution 67 and look forward to the day when the end purpose of this resolution—achieving a balanced budget by restraining spending—becomes a reality.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Chairman, the balanced budget resolution before us today is the single most important vote we will cast since I entered Congress.

The American people have waited a generation for a balanced Federal budget. We House Republicans have delivered.

Passage of this historic balanced budget will show the American people and the world markets that we will balance the Federal budget as promised.

Eliminating the deficit will mean more jobs, lower interest rates, and higher real incomes.

It's high time the Federal Government quits mortgaging our children's and grandchildren's

futures. Every child born this year will face a lifetime bill of \$187,000 for their share of interest on the national debt.

Our budget redesigns the Federal Government to make it smaller, more cost-effective, and less bureaucratic. We cut Government red tape and return power from Washington to State and local governments and the private sector.

Although I might not agree with each and every spending priority in the budget, we will now have the appropriations and reconciliation processes to modify certain specifics.

The bottom line is that we zero out the deficit by the year 2002 without touching Social Security or raising taxes.

I urge a "Yes" vote on the Republican budget resolution.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Republican plan to balance the Federal budget. This is the first time in over 25 years that the Congress has committed to balancing the budget. And, quite frankly, it's long overdue.

Americans across this great country need to know why it is so important to get our federal spending under control and balance the federal budget.

Here are just the numbers. The Federal Government has amassed a debt of over \$4.9 trillion. Even though the Federal Government collected over \$1.3 trillion from taxpayers last year, Congress spent in excess of \$1.5 trillion every year.

So, today, we offer this broad plan for balancing the Federal budget over the next 7 years. Simply put, it ends business as usual and this spend-more-than-you-can-afford attitude that has existed for far too long in Washington.

What does this debt mean to each and every taxpayer? It means that the share of that debt for every American is \$17,000. If we do nothing, our children will have to pay \$200,000 in taxes over their lifetime to cover this debt.

And, because of this debt, we are wasting over \$260 billion a year—a full 16 percent of the total Federal budget—just paying interest. That's money we could be using for more health care, more education, and many other worthy purposes if only we had balanced the budget.

Most important, this debt means that we are playing a high-risk game with our children's future. Saddled with this debt, we threaten their future opportunities.

So today, we lay out a broad plan to balance the budget—while protecting Social Security, as we promised, and while preserving, protecting, and improving Medicare.

As expected, there are those who claim the sky will fall and that we cannot survive without each and every Federal program, without each and every dollar that is spent here in Washington.

Even under this plan to balance the budget, the Federal budget will still increase every year. Let me repeat that. The budget increases every year. In fact Federal spending will increase \$1.2 trillion over the next 7 years. Only in Washington can reasonable increases be called cuts.

What is the alternative? The President has failed to provide a plan to balance the budget. While we are taking the lead and making the tough choices, the President has remained on the sidelines during this critical national de-

bate. It is quite clear that the President does not want to balance the budget.

Despite this, we move forward. To honor our commitment to America, the Congress and the President need to work together. We also must work as a nation to discuss openly the choices we face.

Over the past 4 months, I have heard from thousands of constituents with their ideas, suggestions, and concerns. New Jerseyans know how to make the tough choices for their families and their businesses. In New Jersey, our State balances its budget. In New Jersey, we have made government smaller and more efficient. In New Jersey, we have made sure that taxpayers come first, not last.

Over the next few months, the House will debate and make final decisions on each item proposed in the budget. As we debate our spending priorities, everyone needs to participate. There must be national dialog on where we are today and what we must do for our future.

Today's vote marks a historic beginning. We have set our Nation on the path toward fiscal sanity and a solid future for all Americans.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the budget resolution. Now, I want to be clear in that I do not support every single cut that is presented in the resolution. But that is not the issue before us today.

The issue before us is to outline a blueprint from which each authorizing and appropriations committee will be able to work from. It sets guidelines in which we will be able to work from in our own committees where programs can be thoughtfully analyzed and deliberated. I supported a balanced budget amendment and, therefore, support this proposal which would balance the budget by the year 2002. I find it hypocritical that some of those that say they support the balanced budget amendment now oppose any specific plan to do so.

The naysayers complain that the time is not now to save America. But if not now, when? When our debt reaches \$5 trillion or \$6 trillion? The point is that it is never an easy task to make tough choices. We have well past the time to bite the bullet and pass this blueprint that will put us back onto the road of fiscal accountability.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I oppose House concurrent resolution 67, the Republican budget resolution for fiscal year 1996, and am in strong support of the Congressional Black Caucus alternative proposal. Unfortunately, the second 100-day rush to judgment is well underway with the GOP plan before us, best described as the "balance the budget on the backs of senior citizens, poor children, and working families act." This is an absolutely wrongheaded and unconscionable approach and one that the overwhelming majority of American people, including my constituents, find fault with.

Let's not mince words here Mr. Chairman. The Republican budget resolution steals \$288 billion from the pockets of elderly Medicare patients, rips \$24 billion out of the hands of Social Security recipients, and grabs \$18.7 billion in financial aid to college students for the sole purpose of providing \$355 billion in tax breaks for the wealthiest in this country. In my State of Illinois, this translates to a loss of

over \$2,700 in Medicare services per enrollee by the year 2002 and about a \$5,000 increase in college costs per child for the average family.

But wait that's not all! The American people also receive as a bonus gift the complete elimination of the Department of Education, which will result in a \$141 million reduction in major education State grant programs for my constituents that go to support safe and drug-free schools, vocational and adult training, and our public libraries. Tack on to that drastic reductions of \$187 billion in Medicaid funds for the poor and disabled—expected to strip three million citizens of their long-term health care coverage—as well as a whopping 35 percent in overall nondefense discretionary spending by 2002, and we've got a true case of Robin Hood in reverse! Where is the Sheriff of Nottingham when you really need him, Mr. Chairman?

At a time when the threat of a major world conflict is at its lowest point in the last few decades, where is the sense in increasing the defense budget by \$122 billion while gouging school lunches, child nutrition programs, Head Start, and job training? Does the leadership of this body mean to say that they value B-2 bombers more than they value A-plus grades? Are shiny new planes of more importance than our children's futures?

How can the majority party expect that the variety of problems such as drug abuse, teenage pregnancy, crime, racism, lack of jobs, and poor health care services which face too many residents of our major urban centers, as in my home city of Chicago, are going to be solved if we simply cut, slash, and burn and absolve ourselves of the responsibility to lead? We always hear complaints about how much it will cost to try and attack all of these matters through government action. Well, my friends, ask yourselves what it will cost if we don't? If we adopt the GOP budget, we will be well on our way to finding out.

On the other hand, the CBC budget alternative will achieve the same goal of a balanced budget by 2002 without unfairly singling out middle- and lower-income individuals, families, and seniors to pick up the tab. Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security, through which we do have a contract with America's seniors, are protected from any cuts or alterations.

Additionally, the CBC's reasoned approach recognizes that education and job creation are the keys to increased American competitiveness and a better quality of life across the Nation. In so doing, \$27 billion, or a 25-percent increase over the current budget figures, is invested in vital initiatives such as title I and TRIO programs for underserved pupils as well as summer youth employment and mentoring partnerships which have proved of such great benefit to or communities.

To help offset these investment priorities the CBC budget closes several corporate tax loopholes, effectively ending "corporate welfare as we now know it," and raises the corporate share of the tax burden from 11 to 15 percent in order to correct a long-standing Tax Code imbalance which makes working families shoulder the burden of taxes in this country.

Mr. Chairman I urge my colleagues who, as the CBC alternative budget title states, are in the "caring majority" to reject the Republican leadership's backwards fiscal priorities and support the CBC alternative that truly accounts for the needs of all the American people and

thoughtfully attempts to strengthen opportunities for average families and their children.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the House Republican budget plan.

This proposal, put forth by House Speaker GINGRICH and Budget Committee Chairman KASICH, would give the very wealthy an enormous tax break while at the same time devastating Medicare and other vital programs.

The goal of this budget proposal is one I share: balancing the Federal budget by the year 2002. In January, I voted for a constitutional amendment to balance our Federal budget. I believe we must end the continued policy of running billion-dollar deficits every year which add to the national debt that must be paid by our children and grandchildren.

But we should not balance the budget by cutting student loans, Medicare, Social Security, funding for veterans and infrastructure while offering a \$353 billion tax cut. This outrageous cut will give the wealthiest families a cut of \$20,000 while giving middle-income families only \$555 in tax relief.

We must also balance our budget in a way which does not put such a tremendous burden on our Nation's elderly. Last fall, during town meetings with my constituents, I talked about the "Contract With America," and its potential impact on Social Security and Medicare. I suggested that if the Republican plan were enacted, our seniors would see huge Medicare cuts, higher Medicare premiums and out-of-pocket costs, and an effort to cut Social Security. If you examine the Republican budget closely, it does all three.

It cuts \$283 billion from Medicare over 7 years, meaning that the service currently provided by Medicare will be significantly less in 2002. By cutting the Medicare program by 25 percent in 2002, out-of-pocket costs for seniors will increase by \$1060 in 2002. And, this budget begins the dangerous concept of reducing Social Security cost-of-living-adjustments, beginning in 1999, by altering the Consumer Price Index. This will reduce the average benefit by \$240 per person.

The Republicans have also suggested this plan will actually balance the budget in 2002. Unfortunately, their proposal relies on unsound economics and budget gimmicks to reach a balanced budget. This budget assumes a \$170 billion "economic bonus" between 1996 and 2002 for attempting to balance the budget. This is based on a rosy scenario that our financial markets would react to lower interest rates by an optimistic 2 percent in 2002. Without this bonus, the budget is not balanced, and the promises behind this budget remain unfulfilled.

Mr. Chairman, I support a balanced budget. I believe if we got rid of the \$340 billion tax cut for the wealthy and used those funds to help keep Medicare solvent; if we asked the very wealthy instead to pay their fair share; restored some funding for some of our most needed initiatives, such as student loans; and did not tamper with Social Security, we would reach this goal. Unfortunately, a majority of my colleagues did not agree with our efforts to make these changes in the Budget Committee.

Therefore, I intend to vote against the Kasich budget plan on the floor of the House.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, support this historic budget resolution which puts us on the path to a balanced budg-

et for the first time in a generation. It is vitally important for the sake of our future economic health that we keep our commitment to a balanced budget by 2002.

I must object, however, to including repeal of the Davis-Bacon Act in our budget assumptions. As a number of my colleagues and I stated in our recent letter to Speaker Gingrich, Davis-Bacon is an important and historic worker protection deserving thorough consideration in the legislative process before any attempt at repeal is made.

The Budget Committee projects \$2.7 billion in savings over 5 years from repeal. I don't think all of those savings would materialize because those figures do not take into account the reduced quality of workmanship on Federal projects that could result if the prevailing wage is not paid.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we can produce the needed savings without repeal of Davis-Bacon and I look forward to working with my colleagues who signed the letter and with the leadership to devise a reasonable alternative to repealing the Davis-Bacon Act.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the House Republican fiscal year 1996 budget resolution. Our budget, as promised, outlines a clear path to the elimination of our national deficit by the year 2002. For too many years the Democrat leadership in the House has irresponsibly increased spending while putting the fiscal future of our children in jeopardy. This budget will ensure that the legacy we leave our children in debt free and full of opportunity, rather an ever increasing Federal deficit and a bloated, more intrusive Federal Government. On another level, our plan marks a shift in power away from Federal bureaucrats to families, States, and communities, who know what works best for them.

Over the coming weeks we will hear many say that our budget calls for dramatic cuts in Medicare. This could not be further from the truth. Under our proposal Medicare spending will increase from an average of \$4,700 per recipient to \$6,300 per recipient by the year 2002. As a matter of fact, overall Federal spending grows by about 3 percent annually under the GOP budget plan. The simple truth is that the Medicare trust fund will go bankrupt in just 6 years. The Medicare board of trustees has verified this conclusion. In response to this announcement Republicans have designed a plan to save Medicare. By controlling the amount of growth of all Federal spending, including Medicare, we will put ourselves on track to a balanced budget, and at the same time save Medicare from certain insolvency. Let us pass this budget and bring fiscal sanity to this House for the first time in a generation.

On another matter, note that this budget calls for the elimination of the Department of Commerce. While I recognize the significant savings that would result from this and other efforts to streamline and reduce Government bureaucracy, I would just like to state that the elimination of this Department will not be as easy as simply eliminating funding. The elimination of this agency will require the repealing of a number of underlying statutes and the spinning off of several vital responsibilities. As chairman of the Commerce, Trade, and Hazardous Materials Subcommittee, I will work closely with my Republican colleagues to address these concerns and put ourselves on track for a balanced budget in 2002.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget declares war on biomedical research. The Budget Committee recommends that NIH be cut by \$566 million and frozen there for the next 5 years to produce a savings of \$2.5 billion. Because biomedical research inflation rate is 4.2 percent, the freeze would require drastic reductions of 30 percent in medical research over 7 years.

NIH Director Harold Varmus has testified that this proposal would be a devastating blow to biomedical research. The success rate of research grants would plummet from 24 percent this year to 15 percent or lower in future years. These ill-advised cuts would have a ripple effect on the Nation's science infrastructure. We will lose laboratories, and long-term investments in biomedical research. We stand the risk of losing a generation of new biomedical researchers. What young person would go into a field with such a low probability of success?

America's health and economic competitiveness depend on an adequate level of funding for biomedical research at the NIH. The Republican devastation of NIH will cost us money in the long run. NIH has played a critical role in innovations that have saved 2-3 dollars for each dollar invested in research. Why would we want to reduce our investment by 30 percent?

Mr. Chairman, it is not only the future of NIH that is a stake in this budget, it is the future of most American families. What family in this country has not been touched by heart disease, cancer, Alzheimer's disease, diabetes, mental illness, or substance abuse? What family feels totally safe from AIDS, breast cancer, or genetic diseases?

Why would the Republicans propose to take away hope from so many American families? Apparently to fund huge tax breaks for large corporations and the wealthiest of Americans. This is a bad budget. I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Chairman KASICH and the House Budget Committee for recognizing that we should not balance the budget at the expense of economic opportunity. In fact, the whole point of even having a balanced budget is to promote opportunities for the good and the future of the Nation. I am proud to be a Member of the 104th Congress which recognizes this factor. I appreciate having had the chance to testify before the House Budget Committee on this critical issue and for their action.

I strongly oppose the Clinton's administration's Immigration and Naturalization Service [INS] budget for including a border crossing fee. The INS fee is an excessive burden to American businesses along the United States border with Canada and Mexico.

Illegal immigration is a national problem and measures to enforce our laws should be financed by all Americans, not only those living on the border, who face the burden of illegal immigration. The American border communities already have the undue hardship of illegal aliens depleting valuable medical and social services.

The Clinton border crossing fee is yet another blow to the economic viability of American border communities already devastated by the devaluations of the Mexican peso and the Canadian dollar. The hardworking, tax-paying Americans in the border towns of Presidio, Del Rio, Eagle Pass, and Laredo are facing ruin.

Already scores of American businesses have closed and thousands of hardworking Americans have joined the rolls of the unemployed because of current economic situations.

To impose an additional levy would reduce commerce and violate the spirit of free trade and economic opportunities and hundreds of thousands of American working men and women.

Taxes assessed by the INS on Canadian and Mexican shoppers will reduce purchases of American goods and services. It is imperative that the administration abandon this proposal and that the House Budget Committee work toward this goal.

The impact of a crossing fee on the average foreign-based shopper is considerable. We must think and take into consideration how this affects the Americans who live and work in our border communities and stop treating them like second-class citizens. It is important that these Americans are not singled out by the administration.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my strong support for House Concurrent Resolution 67, the Republican budget plan that moves us to a balanced budget for the first time since 1969. This budget is about America's future—it is a plan that will allow us to enter the next century with America's fiscal house in order. Our country has continued to sink deeper and deeper into debt, and the time has come to restore our Government's economic strength and integrity.

The current budget crisis is taking its toll. Today's \$4.8 trillion debt requires annual interest payments of \$235 billion. If Government spending is not curtailed, the debt will reach \$7.5 trillion by 2005, requiring interest payments of \$412 billion. As early as 1997, Americans could pay as much interest on the debt—\$270 billion—as we pay for national defense. These wasteful debt payments occupy increasingly large portions of our Federal budget, crowding out money that could remain with the taxpayer or be reinvested in America's neighborhoods, infrastructure, schools, and farms.

In addition to decreasing the amount of money that the Government has to pay for its programs, Americans are adversely affected by the debt each time they borrow money to pay for a home, car, or an education. It is estimated that interest rates are about two points higher than they should be under a balanced budget. The Budget Committee tells me that this adds as much as \$37,000 over 30 years to a mortgage on a \$75,000 home.

We must meet our budget crisis head-on for our Nation to be strong and prosperous. We cannot continue to mortgage the future of our children and grandchildren. House Concurrent Resolution 67 moves us toward a balanced budget by the year 2002 by eliminating wasteful spending and reducing the growth rate of many programs. In all, this budget reduces the deficit by about \$1.1 trillion over the next 7 years.

This budget plan not only balances the budget—it also takes action to protect and preserve Medicare. To save it from bankruptcy, House Concurrent Resolution 67 would reduce the unacceptably high rate of growth of Medicare. I have a special interest in this issue given my position on the Ways and Means Committee, which has jurisdiction over Medicare. As you may know, the Social Secu-

rity and Medicare trustees have predicted that the Medicare Part A—hospital insurance—trust fund will be bankrupt in 7 years. That means that by 2002, the funds simply won't be there unless Congress takes some corrective action. In order for Congress to keep its commitment to provide health insurance for the elderly, we must act now to safeguard the system.

The budget resolution recommends three approaches to reforming Medicare, all of which deserve further investigation by the Ways and Means Committee. None of these options would reduce Medicare spending below current levels. In fact, the program would be allowed to continue to grow at a healthy rate, one which is closer to the rate of increase for health care expenditures generally. Under the budget proposal, average spending on a Medicare beneficiary would increase from about \$4,800 today to about \$6,400 in 2002.

I do not agree with every detail of the budget plan's suggested reforms. But when taken as a whole, it is a well-crafted, responsible and balanced measure. It restores fiscal responsibility to our Government for the first time in more than a generation. It's way overdue. Let's act now to safeguard the future of our children and grandchildren.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support for the Budget Committee's budget resolution. This resolution halts the slide in defense spending for the first time in more than a decade. And it represents the first time the Congress has added money for defense to a President's budget since 1981. On average, this proposal will provide the same amount of defense spending as this year—\$270 billion. These additional resources, coupled with a significant reduction in non-defense spending, and an aggressive series of reforms within the Department, are the key components in our Republican plan to begin revitalizing our national security.

After adjusting for inflation, this plan does not increase the defense budget. It does, however, provide \$50 billion more than the Clinton administration had planned to spend. And, perhaps most importantly, it is a plan that keeps the promise we made to the American people: we can both reinvigorate our national security posture and work toward balancing the Federal budget.

Mr. Chairman, some of our colleagues may be asking: Why, as we struggle to balance the budget, should defense appear to be exempt from the pain of cuts? I do not minimize the importance of deficit reduction and the goal of a balanced budget. Indeed, putting the Government's financial house in order is an important element of our Nation's overall security. I believe that strong measures are appropriate and necessary if we are to finally force the Government to balance its books. However, the armed forces have already paid their fair share.

But before I describe to you how steep the defense cuts of the past decade have been, let me remind you of one simple fact.

Defense is different.

As my colleague, Representative SAM BROWNBACK of Kansas, explained in presenting our budget plan, "We've got a whole new mentality: what's the proper role of the Federal Government?" Perhaps the Congress' most solemn charge under the Constitution is to "provide for the common defense." If a Gov-

ernment cannot protect its citizens and interests abroad as well as at home, all its other good works are futile.

And, in my view, we need to restore a more appropriate balance to our priorities. Even as the Federal Government has expanded into areas of our lives never dreamt of by the Founding Fathers, it has come to shortchange those jobs which they considered it alone could do. When national security counts for just one-sixth of the total Federal budget, that's a sign to me that things are out of whack.

The fact is, while other parts of the Federal budget have grown dramatically, the Defense Department has been paying a peace dividend for more than a decade: defense budgets have declined in real terms in each of the last 10 years. Almost alone among Federal departments and agencies, the Pentagon has paid the price of deficit reduction. This year alone, the Defense Department will spend nearly 35 percent less—\$140 billion less—than in 1985. Certainly no other department can come close to those figures. Defense spending now accounts for less than 4 percent of GDP, the lowest percentage in over 45 years.

We are the world's only superpower. And the utility of the Defense Department to the Nation has, if anything, increased. All one has to do is look at the extraordinary deployment rates we demand from our soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines: they're simply going more places and doing more things than at any time in recent history, even during the height of the cold war.

In an uncertain and chaotic world—perhaps especially in such a world—we find that military forces retain their currency. The Soviet Union may no longer exist, but there are plenty of people in this world who wish Americans ill. And who will resort to violence to express that ill-will. And, lest we forget the tragedy in Oklahoma City so soon, who have unprecedented access to powerful technology.

So far, I've talked about numbers: budget cuts, budget shares, budget priorities. Let me tell you what these numbers mean in the real world, where the men and women who wear the uniform live.

First of all, it means fewer troops. Today's military is the smallest force since the end of the Korean War. By the end of fiscal year 1995, the military will be down to about 1.5 million active-duty members, from about 2.2 million in the late 1980's. Since 1990, active Army divisions have been reduced by one third. The active-duty Air Force has cut its inventory of tactical aircraft almost in half. The number of Navy aircraft carriers has been cut by 25 percent, but the total number of combatant ships is down by 32 percent. And make no mistake about it, numbers of troops still matter: in fact, our ability to carry out our national military strategy is in jeopardy, simply for lack of certain highly specialized troops.

Second, it means that these fewer troops are having a tough time keeping ready for all the missions they're being given. Every day new signs of diminished readiness are cropping up. In 1993, the Pentagon's own readiness task force discovered pockets of unreadiness in all the services. Most recently—and shortly after the administration assured the Congress and the Nation that readiness was as high as it had ever been—three of the

Army's divisions were reported as C-3, meaning that they had suffered, in the Army's official definition, a "significant decrease in flexibility and [an] increase in vulnerability"—should they be sent to war? These divisions "would require significant compensation for deficiencies" to be made ready for combat. Air Force air crews in Europe are increasingly requiring waivers for missed training. Navy and Marine Corps aviation squadrons have been grounded due to a lack of maintenance funds.

Third, these troops are being asked to accept a lower standard of living. We should not forget that this administration's initial defense budget proposed freezing servicemembers' pay and benefits—at the same time that they proposed dramatic increases in domestic spending. Last year, the Congress began to correct that wrong, but the quality of service life continues to erode. As deployments—and family separations—lengthen, family housing, troop barracks and mess halls are not getting routine maintenance. There are too many substandard living quarters, too many leaky roofs, too much lead paint.

Fourth, these troops are working with tools that soon will show significant signs of old age. Designing and building weapons is a long-term process; the procurement holiday declared after the victories in the Cold War and the Gulf War is turning into an extended leave of absence. As one retired officer told our committee in hearings this spring: "Our legacy to the next generation is likely to be 45-year-old training aircraft, 35-year-old bombers and airlifters, 25-year-old fighters, 35-year-old trucks and 40-year-old medium-lift helicopters." By this year, the overall Pentagon procurement account has fallen from the 1985 high of \$132 to \$43 billion, a reduction of more than 70 percent.

Finally, the administration's desire to over-extend and over-use our shrinking military forces on an unending stream of peace operations—has dangerously diffused the Defense Department's focus. The Pentagon simply is not keeping its eye on the ball. The administration persists in stretching the reduced force and its reduced budget by sending it on a succession of missions of ambiguous focus, and it compounds the problem by refusing to budget properly for these so-called contingencies. Why long-running operations like the no-fly zones over Iraq and Bosnia should be unforeseen and not budgeted is more than a puzzle; it is a scandal. At this point, the administration's reluctance to budget for its own peacekeeping proclivities must be seen as a sin of commission, not one of omission.

But these missions cause more than budgetary mischief; they have strategic consequences. Sustaining large-scale peace operations for an extended period of time places a heavy burden on certain key military capabilities. The responsibility for these operations has fallen disproportionately on a small number of units: Army military police, port handlers, water purifiers, and quartermasters; and Air Force air cargo carriers—the kind of people who provide food, water, sanitation and showers in inhospitable places, not only to our own troops but to coalition allies, humanitarian relief organizations, even the local populations.

As essential as these units are for peacekeeping operations, they are equally vital in wartime. And the more they participate in peace operations, the less prepared they are to meet the major regional contingencies that

are the backbone of our national security strategy.

Should Iraq threaten Kuwait and Saudi Arabia again, our response time would be lengthened while we withdrew essential units and equipment from the many peacekeeping activities they're now engaged in.

These, and other problems can only be addressed within the context of stable defense budgets: there must be renewed investment, reordered investment priorities, and reformed defense processes. This budget resolution not only allows us to halt the decline in spending, it allows us to spend on the right things, and to spend smarter.

Our first priority is to restore the quality of service life. The service chiefs who helped to craft the early phases of the post-cold-war drawdown worried first and foremost about not breaking the force; in other words, not breaking the basic contract between the Nation and the men and women who wear its uniforms.

We also must take a comprehensive approach to the complex issue of force readiness: not only do we wish to ensure that current problems be solved, but that tomorrow's readiness is not compromised to meet today's shortfalls.

And we must end the procurement holiday. The President's budget request included no new bombers, no scout or attack helicopters, no tanks or fighting vehicles, just a handful of fighter aircraft and insufficient ammunition to replenish stocks. Relatively small investments will provide the necessary link between the force of today and the force of tomorrow.

Some part of this investment must go to revitalize the administration's anemic ballistic missile defense efforts. As rogue states like Iran dedicate themselves to acquiring weapons of mass destruction and the missiles to deliver them, the United States has a moral obligation to pursue a robust effort to defend against these weapons of terror. We must not forget how a crude, conventionally armed Scud missile accounted for the greatest single loss of American lives during the Gulf War. A massive SDI program to develop and deploy exotic technologies is no longer envisioned, but we have an absolute obligation to develop and deploy theater and national missile defenses. It would be unconscionable to protect our troops and friends abroad while insisting that Americans here at home remain vulnerable to ballistic missile attack. Theater and national missile defense must once again become a primary goal, and we must work prudently to make that goal a reality.

We must allow small force structure increases to alleviate the burdens of constant deployments and high operating tempos. We simply cannot ask a small portion of our force to bear a disproportionate burden for non-combat operations.

Finally, we must reform the defense bureaucracy. It must be made to do its proper job, and to do a better job. For example, each year the Government spends about \$200 billion on a wide range of goods and services, from sophisticated Stealth bombers to pencils. Regulations and redtape account for almost one-fifth of that amount. Some are necessary—we should not take risks with the American people's money. But too many mandates leave little room for sound business judgment, initiative and creativity.

The Pentagon, particularly, must learn to do its business more effectively. This is not merely a matter of efficiency, it is part and parcel

of national security in a rapidly changing strategic and technological world. Unless the Pentagon can be as agile as America's adversaries, we will be at risk; our bureaucrats must be as nimble as our fighter aircraft. This year's National Defense Authorization Act will tackle this problem head-on, recommending a host of good-Government and streamlining initiatives that will make sure the Pentagon becomes a better steward of the taxpayers' dollars. Similarly, Representative BILL CLINGER, chairman of the Government Reform and Oversight Committee, and I are today introducing a comprehensive Federal Acquisition Reform Act that will lighten the bureaucrats' burden and let managers manage; they'll be given power and responsibility.

A second goal of our reform effort must be to ensure that the Defense Department sticks to defense. For too long, the defense budget has been the largest cash cow in Washington. Sadly, items in the defense budget are questionable projects that have little to do with national security. Others may be worthwhile, but are not the Defense Department's job.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Budget Committee's budget resolution. Just as we set the rest of the Government on the proper path forward, so it must be with the Pentagon. The decisions we reach about defense spending today will create effects felt not only next year but many years from now. Lieutenants and privates recruited today will become tomorrow's generals and sergeants major. They will not fly the aircraft we order today for a decade. The research we undertake now will produce the new weapons that they will rely on in 20 years. In sum, we must ensure that our future military forces will be assured of being the smartest, best-trained, and best-equipped, and that there will be no doubt in America or around the world that, in Colin Powell's words, a "superpower lives here."

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, "What a difference a year makes." Who could predict a year ago that we would be standing here today debating not one, but four separate, specific proposals to bring our budget into balance. While I do not support each different vision, it is truly gratifying to see the debate shift toward fiscal responsibility and real accountability to the American taxpayer.

I would first like to congratulate Chairman KASICH and his colleagues on the Budget Committee for their tremendous work in crafting the committee's first balanced budget resolution in nearly three decades. We can measure their success by the type of demagogic opposition from those on the other side of the aisle and down the street. Remember, they have no serious proposal. It seems opponents of fiscal responsibility have been reduced to inflammatory rhetoric and misleading assertions of draconian budget cuts. "The sky is falling," they shriek. Nonsense. As you can see from this chart, total outlays under the committee budget will in fact continue to grow at a healthy but responsible rate.

And in fact, we show in the Solomon-Neumann proposal that it's possible to go further and balance the budget in an even more expeditious manner—5 years, rather than 7. This proposal underscores what I have claimed for several years, that there are literally hundreds of billions of dollars of low priority, excessive and wasteful discretionary spending programs

in our current budget. We can cut those programs without touching Social Security and while preserving Medicare benefits. In addition, by balancing the budget in 5 years rather than 7 the national debt will be \$600 billion less, and so we could save an extra \$42 billion in interest payments. The result: interest rates could drop an additional 1 percent. That's good news for families. The Solomon-Neumann budget is, as advertised, truly a contract with our children.

Mr. Chairman, this is an historic occasion for this body. This Congress is on the verge of reasserting our fundamental duty to live within our means. This Congress will rein in runaway spending and bring our budget into balance. But most importantly, Mr. Chairman, as we enter the 21st century, it is this Congress that will preserve a bright future for our children and grandchildren.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman: I rise in support of the Republican budget not because I agree with every detail, but because this nation must balance its budget. If we don't we may go the way of Mexico, and if we go bankrupt, there won't be anyone to bail us out.

The American people should know that the Appropriations Committee will make the final decisions on what programs will be eliminated, what programs will be cut and what programs may be increased. Today, we spend about \$1.12 for every dollar we take in—it's a 12 percent problem and we can fix it.

This budget begins the process of making priorities, we've simply got to determine how much money we have, prioritize our needs and when the money runs out, so do the programs. Every spending program has a rationale, a constituency and a lobby.

There's been a lot of loose talk in this Chamber about so-called cuts in some programs like Medicare. Only in Washington is an increase in spending a cut. The fact is that Medicare will be broke in 7 years. That means in 2002 there will be no money for Medicare. Those who oppose this budget are willing to scare our seniors and are willing to lie to them, in the pursuit of politics. To vote against this budget is to tell our seniors that we don't care about their healthcare—that we are willing to cast them out—just for politics.

The fact is, under this budget, Medicare spending will increase from \$4,700 to \$6,300 in the next 7 years—that's a 40 percent increase per recipient. That's hardly a cut anywhere in America, except on the other side of the aisle.

This budget lays out a road map to follow to a balanced budget and a healthy Medicare System in 7 years. We may not agree with every dot and tittle in this budget—they'll be worked out in the Appropriations Committee—but we must agree with a balanced budget, with a healthy Medicare System, and Social Security off the table.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Chairman, America in ruins. That's right. Even if you put aside for a moment the harm that the Kasich budget does to Medicare, student loans, and everyday Americans, you are left, in terms of our Nation's infrastructure, with a blueprint for disaster.

Forget what we have learned over the past 20 years: That our infrastructure investment has a direct bearing on our ability to compete in the global economy; that an enhanced infrastructure can greatly further productivity, lower the cost of production and increase employ-

ment; and that our infrastructure is critical to upgrading the standard of living and quality of life for all Americans.

Forget what we know about the current needs of our transportation systems, wastewater treatment, and water supply facilities: That more than one-half—56 percent—of the Nation's major roadways are in poor to fair condition and are in need of immediate repair, with the cost to eliminate backlogged highway deficiencies estimated at \$212 billion; that more than 70 percent of peak-hour travel on urban interstates occurs under congested or severely congested conditions, generating costs from wasted fuel and lost productivity to the economy of \$39 billion per year; that one out of three bridges in America is rated structurally deficient or functionally obsolete; that almost one-fourth of the Nation's rail transit facilities are in poor condition, and one-fifth of our transit buses must be replaced as soon as possible; that we now have 23 airports experiencing more than 20,000 hours of aircraft delay annually, costing our economy as much as \$6 billion every year; and that more than 10,000 of our 75,000 dams are classified as high hazard, meaning they would cause loss of life and extreme property damage should they fail; 13,549 are classified as being of significant hazard, meaning significant property damage would be sustained if they fail; and about 2,000 are considered unsafe or in need of repair.

Forget—we should not—but that is what the Kasich budget plan does. As a result, spending for infrastructure would decline dramatically.

For transportation, in 1996, the Kasich budget calls for a 1.3-percent cut below 1995 spending. By the year 2002 this would increase to a 14.6-percent cut below last year's spending, representing, because the Kasich budget fails to take account of inflation, a 30.3-percent decline in real transportation purchasing power.

Specific transportation cuts would include the following:

Freeze user-fee supported highway program. The Republican budget freezes the highway program at last year's level notwithstanding the fact that it is supported exclusively by user fees and does not contribute one penny toward the deficit.

Phase out Mass Transit Operating Assistance. The budget phases out operating assistance for local transit agencies between 1996 and 1999, cutting an additional 25 percent each year. This proposal cuts \$193 million in 1996, \$385 million in 1997, \$578 million in 1998, and \$770 million in 1999 through 2002.

No new starts for fixed guideway capital grants. The budget terminates funding for new section 3 mass transit systems, cutting \$12 million in outlays in 1996, increasing to \$645 million in 2002.

Terminate rail programs. The budget eliminates high-speed rail development and the local rail freight assistance program, terminates the Pennsylvania Station Redevelopment Project, and ends funding for the Northeast Corridor Improvement Program in 1999.

Eliminate air transportation programs. The budget eliminates the essential air services program, grants to reliever airports, the Civil Aeronautical Institute, the FAA Management Training Institute, and Air Traffic Control Revitalization Act premium pay.

Cut Coast Guard operating expenses. The Republican budget cuts funding for Coast

Guard operations by \$65 million, or 3 percent, in 1996 and freezes funding at this reduced level for the following 6 years. By 2002, this would mean a 24-percent loss in real purchasing power.

For environmental programs, in 1996, the Republican plan calls for a 14.2-percent cut below 1995. In 2002, the plan proposes a 15.2-percent cut below 1995, representing a 32.8-percent decline in real purchasing power.

Major changes proposed by the Republicans would include the following:

Cut funds for sewage treatment and safe drinking water facilities. The Republican budget proposes to cut funding for construction and upgrading of sewage treatment and drinking water facilities by \$650 million, or 22 percent, in 1996 and then to freeze funding at this reduced level for the following 6 years. By 2002, this would mean a 38 percent loss in real purchasing power.

Cut Corps of Engineers construction. The Republican budget calls for cutting funds for Corps of Engineers water resources construction projects by \$172 million, or 19 percent, in 1996. Although the cut is reduced beginning in 1998, in 2002 funding would still be 7 percent below 1995—representing a 26 percent real cut in purchasing power.

Reduce Superfund spending. The budget calls for reducing appropriations from the Superfund for hazardous waste cleanup by 10 percent in 1996 and then freezing appropriations at that reduced level for the following 6 years. By 2002, purchasing power would be down 30 percent.

For regional development programs, in 1996, the Republican plan calls for a 25.3 percent cut below 1995. In 2002, the plan proposes a 25.5 percent cut below 1995, representing a 40.6 percent decline in real purchasing power.

Major changes proposed by the Republicans would include the following—

Eliminate the Economic Development Administration.

Eliminate the Appalachian Regional Commission.

Eliminate the nonpower programs of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. Chairman, these are but a few examples of the many real infrastructure hardships this budget advocates.

American in ruins. Sound familiar? That is the title of a 1983 best-seller which, for the first time, brought to the forefront of American politics the important role that infrastructure plays in the world economy.

Let me read from the conclusion of that work:

Economic renewal must be the premier focus of domestic policy in this decade. Our public infrastructure is strategically bound-up in that renewal. Without attention to deterioration of that infrastructure, economic renewal will be thwarted if not impossible.

We have no recourse but to face the complex task at hand of rebuilding our public facilities as an essential prerequisite to economic renewal and maintenance of our quality-of-life.

How quickly we forget—how much the Kasich Republican plan forgets.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on the Republican budget.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to note that a number of our colleagues on the

other side of the aisle have shown pictures of their children during the course of the debate on budget priorities. These children are beautiful; they have bright futures; and, I am sure they are the pride and joy of their lucky parents. I know; I am the lucky mother of five wonderful children.

With all due respect to my colleagues however, I would note that we are here in Congress to represent all of the children of our districts and, in fact, our Nation, not just our own children. Our children are the lucky ones—they are covered by their parents' congressional health benefits; and, with the benefit of their parents' congressional salaries, they have decent housing and will be able to afford higher education.

It is not enough to gauge the brilliance of the future of this great Nation by its impact on our own children. We, as Federal legislators, have an obligation to all of this Nation's children. Our children are not only the ones in our families. They are also the children down the street, in low income housing, and tragically, sometimes not in housing at all but out on the street. Unless we meet their needs too, the future of our children is not as bright.

The Republican budget before us today is not for America's children, it is only for the children of the privileged few.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 67 which sets out the annual budget limits that will enable our Federal Government to achieve a balanced budget over the next 7 years. Our country faces a deficit crisis that can only be resolved through an honest commitment to the basic idea that our Federal Government can no longer afford to live beyond its means. With this resolution, Congress has an historic opportunity to put an end to the business-as-usual partisan bickering that has resulted in a \$4.8 trillion debt that threatens to overwhelm our Nation's economy. It is time to stand together and do the heavy lifting that is needed to put our country's balance sheet in order.

This year's interest obligation on the debt is \$235 billion, and over the next 15 years—if current patterns are allowed to continue—accumulated interest payments will total several trillion dollars. You don't need to be a finance expert to understand that this year's \$235 billion interest payment on the Government's debt means that we have that much less money to fund critical government functions like crime control, education, and transportation initiatives. On a personal level, these growing interest payments will mean that my 13-year-old son Carlton will be saddled with approximately \$125,000 in additional taxes during his expected lifetime to pay for his share of the interest obligation.

Even now, Americans are paying for this debt in the form of interest rates that are about 2 percentage points higher than they would be if the budget were balanced. This adds as much as \$37,000 over 30 years to the mortgage on a \$75,000 home. A 2-percent reduction in interest rates will result in the following economic benefits:

It will lead to the creation of 4.25 million more jobs over the next 10 years.

It will increase per capita incomes 16.1 percent.

It will generate \$235 billion more revenue for the Federal Government without a tax increase.

It will generate \$232 billion more revenue for State and local governments without a tax increase.

As the former chairman of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, I can report from firsthand experience that a spendthrift Federal Government with unrestrained deficits will inevitably attempt to pass the buck on to State and local governments in the form of unfunded mandates. While we addressed part of this problem with the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, we will never fully cure the Federal Government's habit of passing the buck until we adopt a firm balanced budget policy that forces the Government to live within its means. When I was elected county board chairman in Fairfax County, VA—a county of 900,000 residents with the second largest county budget in the Nation—we were faced with more than a \$200 million deficit that threatened the financial security and well-being of the county. Well, we rolled up our sleeves and went to work. We made the county government leaner and more efficient. We set priorities and stayed on focus to achieve a balanced budget, without tax hikes, that featured added funding for education. Two years later, Fairfax County was voted best financially managed county in the country by City and State magazine and I learned that fiscal responsibility creates economic opportunity and has the power to restore the average taxpayer's faith in government.

It is now time to restore faith in the Federal Government. This resolution sets tough budget limits that will require difficult choices and painful spending cuts. I oppose several of the individual, non-binding proposals that are contained in the committee report that accompanies this resolution. I will continue to fight to see that the more than two million hard working Federal employees are not unfairly targeted for pay and benefit cuts. While we all must share in the sacrifices that are necessary to achieve a balanced budget, I believe that Federal workers were unfairly singled out for a 2.5 percent pay cut and a sizeable reduction in promised retirement pay contained in H.R. 1215—the tax bill.

I voted against the rule that limited amendments and against final passage of H.R. 1215. The other body has not embraced these pay cuts, and I am confident that the end result of this budget process will be much more acceptable to the Federal worker than the provisions contained in the misguided tax bill. I am pleased that this resolution recommends the formation of a high-level commission to study the security of our military and civil service retirement funds. The Congressional Research Service and General Accounting Office are on record as certifying that these retirement systems have no unfunded liability problem and face no threat of insolvency. I applaud this resolution for embracing a long-range, analytical approach to the questions raised during the tax bill debate about the solvency of these retirement funds. This resolution appears to recognize that any increase in employee contribution rates based on the argument that these funds are unstable should be postponed until the commission makes findings and recommendations.

There is some good news for northern Virginians in this balanced budget plan: our METRO system is fully funded until its planned completion; retired civil servants and military personnel do not face reduced or delayed cost-of-living allowances; and, the U.S.

Geological Survey remains intact and viable in its Reston headquarters.

Let's put partisanship aside for the sake of our children's economic security. To those critics who focus solely on the sacrifices required to balance our budget, I say: Where is your plan? This resolution represents a solid plan to balance the budget over 7 years. A balanced budget will directly result in lower interest rates, a stable dollar in the international market, and long-term economic security. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of House Concurrent Resolution 67.

The CHAIRMAN. No further debate is in order. Accordingly, pursuant to House Resolution 149, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having assumed the chair, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 67) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, as amended, he reported the concurrent resolution, as amended, back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the amendment printed in H. Rept. 104-125 is adopted.

Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, does House rule XXI(c) requiring a three-fifths vote to increase Federal taxes apply to the \$17.4 billion tax increase contained in the Republican budget resolution due to the consumer price index cut?

The SPEAKER. The Chair appreciates the gentleman's parliamentary inquiry, and the Chair interprets clause 5(c) of rule XXI to apply only to the passage or adoption of a bill, a joint resolution, an amendment thereto, or a conference report thereon. The rule does not apply to the adoption of a concurrent resolution.

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I am a freshman. On my first day here I voted that a three-fifth vote of this body be required to pass a tax increase.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not in order.

Mr. WARD. Is this not a bill, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. This is not a bill. The gentleman is a freshman. He should study this. It is not a bill.

Mr. WARD. It is not a question of studying, Mr. Speaker. What is the voter to think if we do not call a bill a bill?

The SPEAKER. The question is on the concurrent resolution, as amended.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 193, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No 345]

YEAS—238

| | | |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Allard | Gallegly | Myrick |
| Archer | Ganske | Nethercutt |
| Army | Gekas | Neumann |
| Bachus | Geren | Ney |
| Baker (CA) | Gilchrest | Norwood |
| Baker (LA) | Gillmor | Nussle |
| Ballenger | Gilman | Oxley |
| Barr | Gingrich | Packard |
| Barrett (NE) | Goodlatte | Parker |
| Bartlett | Goodling | Paxon |
| Barton | Goss | Petri |
| Bass | Graham | Pombo |
| Bateman | Greenwood | Porter |
| Bereuter | Gunderson | Portman |
| Bilbray | Gutknecht | Pryce |
| Bilirakis | Hall (TX) | Quillen |
| Bliley | Hancock | Quinn |
| Blute | Hansen | Radanovich |
| Boehlert | Hastert | Ramstad |
| Boehner | Hastings (WA) | Regula |
| Bonilla | Hayworth | Riggs |
| Bono | Hefley | Roberts |
| Brownback | Heineman | Rogers |
| Bryant (TN) | Herger | Rohrabacher |
| Bunn | Hilleary | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Bunning | Hobson | Roth |
| Burr | Hoekstra | Roukema |
| Burton | Hoke | Royce |
| Buyer | Horn | Salmon |
| Callahan | Hostettler | Sanford |
| Calvert | Houghton | Saxton |
| Camp | Hunter | Scarborough |
| Canady | Hutchinson | Schaefer |
| Castle | Hyde | Schiff |
| Chabot | Inglis | Seastrand |
| Chambliss | Istook | Sensenbrenner |
| Chenoweth | Johnson (CT) | Shadegg |
| Christensen | Johnson, Sam | Shaw |
| Chrysler | Jones | Shays |
| Clinger | Kasich | Shuster |
| Coble | Kelly | Skeen |
| Coburn | Kim | Smith (MI) |
| Collins (GA) | King | Smith (NJ) |
| Combest | Kingston | Smith (TX) |
| Condit | Klug | Smith (WA) |
| Cooley | Knollenberg | Solomon |
| Cox | Kolbe | Souder |
| Crane | LaHood | Spence |
| Crapo | Largent | Stearns |
| Cremeans | Latham | Stockman |
| Cubin | LaTourette | Stump |
| Cunningham | Laughlin | Talent |
| Davis | Lazio | Tate |
| Deal | Leach | Tauzin |
| DeLay | Lewis (CA) | Taylor (MS) |
| Diaz-Balart | Lewis (KY) | Taylor (NC) |
| Dickey | Lightfoot | Thomas |
| Doolittle | Linder | Thornberry |
| Dornan | Livingston | Tiahrt |
| Dreier | LoBiondo | Torkildsen |
| Duncan | Longley | Upton |
| Dunn | Lucas | Vucanovich |
| Ehlers | Manzullo | Waldholtz |
| Ehrlich | Martini | Walker |
| Emerson | McCollum | Walsh |
| English | McCrery | Wamp |
| Ensign | McDade | Watts (OK) |
| Everett | McHugh | Weldon (FL) |
| Ewing | McInnis | Weldon (PA) |
| Fawell | McIntosh | Weller |
| Fields (TX) | McKeon | White |
| Foley | Metcalf | Whitfield |
| Forbes | Meyers | Wicker |
| Fowler | Mica | Wolf |
| Fox | Miller (FL) | Young (AK) |
| Franks (CT) | Molinari | Young (FL) |
| Franks (NJ) | Montgomery | Zeliff |
| Frelinghuysen | Moorhead | Zimmer |
| Frisa | Morella | |
| Funderburk | Myers | |

NAYS—193

| | | |
|--------------|------------|-------------|
| Abercrombie | Bentsen | Brown (FL) |
| Ackerman | Bevill | Brown (OH) |
| Andrews | Bishop | Bryant (TX) |
| Baesler | Bonior | Cardin |
| Baldacci | Borski | Chapman |
| Barcia | Boucher | Clay |
| Barrett (WI) | Brewster | Clayton |
| Becerra | Browder | Clement |
| Beilenson | Brown (CA) | Clyburn |

| | | |
|---------------|----------------|---------------|
| Coleman | Johnson, E. B. | Pomeroy |
| Collins (MI) | Johnston | Poshard |
| Conyers | Kanjorski | Rahall |
| Costello | Kaptur | Rangel |
| Coyne | Kennedy (MA) | Reed |
| Cramer | Kennedy (RI) | Reynolds |
| Danner | Kennelly | Richardson |
| de la Garza | Kildee | Rivers |
| DeFazio | Klink | Roemer |
| DeLauro | LaFalce | Rose |
| Dellums | Lantos | Roybal-Allard |
| Deutsch | Levin | Rush |
| Dicks | Lewis (GA) | Sabo |
| Dingell | Lincoln | Sanders |
| Dixon | Lipinski | Sawyer |
| Doggett | Lofgren | Schroeder |
| Dooley | Lowe | Schumer |
| Doyle | Luther | Scott |
| Durbin | Maloney | Serrano |
| Edwards | Manton | Sisisky |
| Engel | Markey | Skaggs |
| Eshoo | Martinez | Skelton |
| Evans | Mascara | Slaughter |
| Farr | Matsui | Spratt |
| Fattah | McCarthy | Stark |
| Fazio | McDermott | Stenholm |
| Fields (LA) | McHale | Stokes |
| Filner | McKinney | Studds |
| Flake | Meehan | Stupak |
| Flanagan | Meek | Tanner |
| Foglietta | Menendez | Tejeda |
| Ford | Mfume | Thompson |
| Frank (MA) | Miller (CA) | Thornton |
| Frost | Mineta | Thurman |
| Furse | Minge | Torres |
| Gedensson | Mink | Torricelli |
| Gephardt | Moakley | Towns |
| Gibbons | Mollohan | Tucker |
| Gonzalez | Moran | Velazquez |
| Gordon | Murtha | Vento |
| Green | Nadler | Visclosky |
| Gutierrez | Neal | Volkmer |
| Hall (OH) | Oberstar | Ward |
| Hamilton | Obey | Waters |
| Harman | Olver | Watt (NC) |
| Hastings (FL) | Ortiz | Waxman |
| Hayes | Orton | Williams |
| Hefner | Owens | Wilson |
| Hilliard | Pallone | Wise |
| Hinchey | Pastor | Woolsey |
| Holden | Payne (NJ) | Wyden |
| Hoyer | Payne (VA) | Wynn |
| Jackson-Lee | Pelosi | Yates |
| Jacobs | Peterson (FL) | |
| Jefferson | Peterson (MN) | |
| Johnson (SD) | Pickett | |

NOT VOTING—4

| | |
|--------------|---------|
| Berman | Klecza |
| Collins (IL) | McNulty |

□ 1609

So the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 345 on House Concurrent Resolution 67 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted "no."

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT FRIDAY, MAY 19, 1995, TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 1561, AMERICAN OVERSEAS INTERESTS ACT OF 1995

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on International Relations have until midnight, Friday, May 19, 1995, to file a report on the bill (H.R. 1561) to consolidate the foreign affairs agencies of the United States; to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1996 and 1997; to responsibly re-

duce the authorizations of appropriations for United States foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 1996 and 1997, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I was present and voted no on rollcall vote No. 337, final passage of H.R. 961, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act amendments. Unfortunately, due to a technical difficulty, my vote was not recorded.

I ask that the RECORD be clear that I voted on opposition to final passage of H.R. 961.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1158, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND RESCISSIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1995

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 151 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 151

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1158) making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Boston, MA [Mr. MOAKLEY], the former chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Pending that, Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. All time yielded is for debate purposes only.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for consideration of the conference report to accompany the bill, H.R. 1158, a measure providing emergency supplemental appropriations for disaster assistance and rescissions for fiscal year 1995. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration.

In particular, I would note that the conference report violates clause 3, rule XXVIII, relating to scope, because appropriations related to the terrorist